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 Baksys against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.

The application Ref 17/01473/FUL, dated 30 August 2017, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2017.

The development proposed is application to construct gable roof extension, loft conversion, 2 x rooflights to the rear slope and 1 storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the extensions on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located at one end of a row of two storey dwellings that front Herbert Gardens. Herbert Gardens itself is characterised by a number of groups of two storey dwellings. These mainly have strong hipped roof forms although I appreciate that an addition has been made to No 14.

4. To allow the provision of a dormer window the roof of the dwelling would be changed from a hip to a gable end with an increase in the roof height across the width of the dwelling. As a result the hip roof form would be lost. The dormer structure would be set in from the side walls of the dwelling leaving some roof verge visible around the sides. However at the top and bottom of the structure this amount would be very limited. In particular the submitted section provided on the plans shows the top edge in alignment with the ridge. As such it would be a very large element proud of the main roof plane. I consider that it would, inevitably, dominate the overall roof structure. I also find that the large number of windows proposed (five in total) on the face of this large structure would draw the eye. Their positions would not align with the fenestration on the floors beneath and the overall impression would be of a poorly articulated ‘add-on’ roof element.

5. In addition the hip to gable change would be visible in the front elevation from the street in Herbert Gardens and the rear elements from the gardens of surrounding dwellings. There are no other structures in the rear roof slopes of existing dwellings in the immediate area and an addition of the size proposed
would dominate views of the rear roof of the dwelling. I appreciate that there have been changes made to No 14. However, by contrast to the appeal scheme the hip roof of this dwelling remains apparent and the addition appears subservient to the main house. Consequently, whilst I note the quality of materials proposed, the structure would appear as a dominant and incongruous feature in the roof of the proposed dwelling and surrounding area.

6. Therefore the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the proposed dwelling and its surroundings. It would therefore be in conflict with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document and the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions and Alterations. It would also conflict with the core principle of the National Planning Policy Framework that planning should always seek to secure high quality design.

Other Matters

7. I appreciate that there would not be any adverse impact on neighbouring dwellings, that the extensions would improve the layout, space and condition of the dwelling as a family home. However, none of these matters alters or outweighs my findings on the main issue.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D J Board

INSPECTOR