Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2016

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10 February 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/15/3135757
13 Ventnor Gardens, Barking, Essex IG11 9JY

- 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 Layes Miah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
- The application Ref 15/00665/FUL, dated 15 May 2015, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2015.
- The development proposed is a two storey side and rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Ventnor Gardens is characterised by terraces of 20th century houses of traditional appearance with front projecting bay windows. The appeal property is at the end of a terrace of four houses and similarly to others on the road has a hipped roof with a gabled bay.

4. Between the terraces there are pairs of garages which are set back from the front walls of the houses. This pattern provides a unified appearance to the street. On my visit I noted that the appeal property did not have a garage but the adjacent property does.

5. The reason for refusal concerns only the two storey side extension. The Council has no objection to the proposed rear extensions and I see no reason to disagree.

6. The Council’s Supplementary Planning Document¹ (SPD) provides guidance on side extensions to terraced houses in paragraph 5.4.2. That paragraph states that where gaps between buildings contribute positively to the character of the area the first floor should be set off the side boundary of the site.

7. I saw that 16 and 18 Ventnor Gardens have adjoining side extensions which have joined two terraces together. Other than this however the character of

¹ London Borough of Barking & Dagenham Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012)
the street, particularly on its north eastern side remains as one of short terraces separated by gaps containing set back pairs of garages. The proposal would erode that character by partially filling one of the characteristic gaps. If the proposal were to be allowed it is likely that the Council would find it difficult to resist further similar extensions which would cumulatively have a significant effect on the character of the area.

8. There are other examples of two storey side extensions in Ventnor Gardens and Lyndhurst Gardens some of which fill gaps between terraces. The Council says that the extension at 5 Ventnor Gardens originally had permission in 2005 and it appears that others in the area are of some age and pre-date the SPD. The appellant has cited an example in Lyndhurst Gardens where it appears that extensions have been designed in combination. The other existing extensions do not change my view that the further infilling of gaps would be harmful.

9. At ground floor level the side extension would be flush with the front wall of the house and some way forward of the adjacent garage. The first floor would be set back by 0.5 metre but would still be forward of the adjacent garage. The proximity of the extension to the frontage and the proposed side parapet wall would give prominence to the extension which would be unsympathetic. Although the design of the extension would otherwise harmonise with the dwelling, for the reasons given the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area.

10. Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy\(^2\) requires high quality design and in particular that local character is strengthened. Policy BP8 of the Development Policies\(^3\) similarly requires development to have regard to the local character of the area. Policy BP11 of that document requires the protection and enhancement of character and amenity. For the reasons given the proposal would not accord with those policies.

**Conclusion**

11. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Nick Palmer*

INSPECTOR

---

\(^2\) London Borough of Barking & Dagenham Core Strategy (2010)

\(^3\) London Borough of Barking & Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies (2011)