The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.

The appeal is made by Mr Pellumb Mazreku against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.

The application Ref 18/00193/FUL was refused by notice dated 8 August 2018.

The development proposed is a loft conversion with rear dormer and front skylight.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the development on the living conditions of occupiers of Nos 9 and 10 Crane Close, with particular reference to visual impact.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern two-storey end of terrace dwelling. It lies at the end of a row of properties in Church Elm Lane and adjacent to the rear gardens of properties in Crane Close.

4. Planning permission was granted for the erection of a two storey dwelling, Ref.16/00535/FUL, and subsequently planning permission was granted to vary Condition 2 to add a two storey rear extension, front porch and alterations to the front windows of the previously approved scheme. The appeal is to retain a loft conversion involving the construction of a gable end roof, rear dormer window and installation of a front rooflight.

5. The development includes a wide gable end facing the rear of properties in Crane Close. The neighbouring properties at Nos 9 and 10 Crane Close have short rear gardens and windows facing this flank wall.

6. From my observations, the gable end roof has resulted in the creation of an imposing flank wall elevation creating a significant bulk which coupled with the proximity to the site boundary results in an overbearing impact on the occupants of Nos 9 and 10 Crane Close. It makes their rear gardens less

https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate
pleasant places to use and has an unacceptably imposing impact on outlook from rear windows. For these reasons, I consider that the development has a significant material impact on the living conditions of these neighbours, which does not help create a positive sense of local identity. Therefore, the development is contrary to Policy BP8 in the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011) and supporting guidance in the Council’s Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012), where they seek to protect residential amenity. Policy BP8 is broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework where the Framework seeks to protect residential amenity.

7. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised that I have not specifically commented upon, including examples elsewhere. I have determined the proposal before me on its individual merits.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR