Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2017

by Timothy C King  BA(Hons) MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3178272
4 Dronfield Gardens, Dagenham RM8 2YD

- 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 Mrs Adele Edwin-Lamerton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/00122/FUL, dated 23 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2017.
- The development proposed is a two storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the proposal’s effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace, two-storey dwelling. Its characteristic hip-ended roof has been recently extended to form a gable-end under permitted development entitlement. The dwelling is set within a triangular-shaped curtilage at the point where the road bends to the left and the neighbouring property, No 5, shows a similar arrangement.

4. The proposal would involve the removal of a detached side garage and the erection of a part two, part single-storey side addition which would extend the dwelling up to the common boundary with No 5 and then follow the angled line back to meet the dwelling’s existing rear wall. Its frontage would increase substantially in width from approximately 4.9m to an expanse exceeding 14m.

5. The extended building would display a variety of roof forms whereby the gable-end would be extended with the ridgeline dropping at roughly mid-point to a short flat section. This would then allow for the inclusion of a part-hip-end which would, in turn, drop to meet the flat-roof of the single-storey section.

6. In the context of the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and its immediate surroundings the proposal would represent an immodest development relative to the existing dwelling which I consider would involve such a degree of alteration as to be disharmonious, distorting the original design significantly. This would be contrary to relevant guidance contained within the Council’s Supplementary Planning Document `Residential Extensions.
and Alterations’ (SPD) which advises that such development should respect the character of the existing dwelling, having regard also to its proportions so as not create an unbalanced appearance. Reference is also made to the need for appropriate roof treatment, which I find would here lack cohesion, and that side extensions should not involve the loss of prominent and characteristic gaps. In this instance I find that the proposal would fail all such provisos, leading to a marked and detrimental impact on the streetscene.

7. The appellant, in support of her case, cites the existence of certain local extensions. However, whilst certain parallels might be drawn, such as examples involving corner properties, in analysing these developments and the planning permissions granted I have found obvious differences. Although both No 5, and No 35, directly opposite, have been subject to considerable extension, both developments involve the addition of single-storey side extensions. The degree of visual impact is thereby considerably less than that which would result from the proposal.

8. Two other properties, No 105 Markygate Road and No 39 Verney Road, have recently secured planning permission for two-storey side extensions but both, whilst involving significant width increase, replicate the original design and project the characteristic hip-ends. Having had regard to the above and the photographs provided of other examples, these previous decisions do not outweigh the harm I have identified would result from the current proposal. Besides, each proposal is determined on its own merits and impacts resulting from the individual circumstances involved.

9. Although the appellant refers to the proposal’s positive impact on the property, and I acknowledge the significant floorspace increase, I consider that the extension’s design, when viewed externally, would involve a development that would neither integrate within the streetscene nor complement the host dwelling. In the circumstances, I find that the proposal would be contrary to relevant advice on design matters within paragraphs 58 and 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The use of matching materials would not mitigate in this regard.

Other matters

10. The appellant, in paragraph 6.6 of her Statement, makes reference to what appears may have been a former local planning policy (H22 and Appendix 7). However, as no details are provided as to this policy’s document source I have not afforded this point any weight. Similarly, although mention is made as to sustainable development the proposal is an extension to an existing dwelling and there are no details as to its particular relevance in this instance.

11. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and would be in material conflict with the aims and objectives of Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and also the Council’s SPD.

12. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

Timothy C King
INSPECTOR