

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2017

**by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 2 February 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/16/3162091**

**85 Lodge Avenue, Dagenham, RM8 2JH**

- 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 Nural Jaman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
  - The application Ref 16/01084/FUL dated 12 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2016.
  - The development proposed is '*First floor side extension; part first floor rear extension and front extension.*'
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matter

2. The main element in this appeal relates to the proposed side and rear extension at first floor level. The Council has raised no objection to the proposed full width, single-storey front extension and although the occupier of the adjoining property at No 83 considers that this addition would involve a loss of light to this dwelling I do not consider that this any such reduction would be so significant as to be unacceptable. As such, I have limited my assessment to that of the proposed first floor extension.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, with particular regard to the relationship with properties eastwards along Ilchester Road.

## Reasons

4. The two-storey appeal dwelling sits end-of-terrace at the corner of Lodge Avenue and Ilchester Road. It has already been extended to the side and rear by means of a single storey addition and the appeal proposal seeks to build above this so as to provide extra bedroom space. The Council's objection is based on the fact that the resultant addition over two-storeys would sit forward of the building line along Ilchester Road to the rear, although this is already the case with the existing single storey side addition.
-

5. At my site visit I noted that the development pattern of the terrace of Nos 79 to 85 Lodge Avenue, where the latter property's side building line accords with that of the front building line of the dwellings behind, is reflected in the neighbouring terrace, Nos 63 to 69 Lodge Avenue. Here, No 63's flank wall lines up with the properties in Fitzstephen Road. Accordingly, this openness to the side of the end-of-terrace properties is a characteristic feature in the immediate locality.
6. In the circumstances I consider that, despite the existence of the single storey side extension, the consequential bulk of an overlying first floor addition would compound and be intrusive in the streetscene, unduly affecting the characteristic openness of the street corner layout. This physical relationship, as originally arranged, would have been laid out to serve a particular planning purpose, and the proposal in this instance would thereby be contrary to the aims of Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Council's Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) which, amongst other things, stipulate that all development should have regard to, and protect, local character. More specifically, it is also contrary to the design guidance provided by the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' (SPD) which advises that extensions should not normally extend beyond the adjacent building line which shares the junction.
7. Although I am not convinced that the proposal would unduly impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling itself I have concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area thereby conflicting with DPD Policies BP8 and BP11 and also relevant guidance within the Council's SPD.
8. I have noted the appellant's comments in his written statement but I do not consider that any increased highway width afforded to Ilchester Road near to the site would outweigh the harm I have identified would result from the proposal. I have had regard to the nearby extension cited by the appellant but as each case must be assessed on its own individual merits, or otherwise, its existence cannot confirm the acceptability of the current proposal.
9. Finally, whilst I agree with the Council's approach with regard to the acceptability of the front extension this element is married to the proposal as a whole and, as such, it is not severable from the intended development. Accordingly, I am therefore unable to reach a split decision and allow the front extension as a separate entity.
10. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

*Timothy C King*

INSPECTOR