
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2017

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 05/09/17

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/17/3173955

1 Rockwell Road, Dagenham RM10 8JA

- 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 Asif Iqbal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 16/02006/FUL, dated 20 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey single dwelling adjacent to 1 Rockwell Road, Dagenham.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling, part of the inter-war Becontree Estate which, in terms of layout and design, is typically redolent of its time.
4. The terrace straddles the junction of Rockwell Road and Hunters Hall Road and its appearance is distinctive in that the two end dwellings (62 Hunters Hall Road and 1 Rockwell Road) are angled away from the mid-terrace dwelling to front their respective streets. This characteristic physical arrangement is also evident on the opposite side of Hunters Hall Road, at its junction with Dunbar Gardens.
5. At both the above terraces the end properties have significant side gaps between their flank walls and those of their respective neighbours which, in the case of the appeal site, is No 3 Rockwell Road, itself an end-of-terrace property.
6. The Council recently issued a Certificate of Lawfulness for the extension of No 1 involving, in part, a hip to gable end roof extension. The development has since been implemented. The proposed dwelling would adjoin this flank and the development would virtually infill the side gap. No 1 is also different in design to No 3 and the terrace of which it forms part, with a deeper front roof slope and a higher ridgeline. The development would continue this ridgeline

- and, although reintroducing a hip-end, extending the terrace in this fashion would make for an awkward physical relationship with No 3.
7. The appellant mentions that the proposal would be in accordance with the Council's SPD Householder Design Guidance, but such guidance is not applicable here as the proposal involves a new independent dwelling. Indeed, he refers to the development as an extension to the existing dwelling and comments that it would reflect the appearance of the main house while being suitably subordinate. It would be subordinate in terms of its limited frontage width due to the constraints of the side gap but, for a new dwelling in its own right, such a design approach is not necessarily appropriate. Moreover, in attempting to utilise the limited space available, the proposal would appear as an inappropriate and cramped form of development.
 8. Although the National Planning Policy Framework advises that planning decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes the document also says that decisions should aim to ensure that developments respond to local character and reflect the identity of local surroundings. In this particular instance the proposal would be inconsistent with the prevailing pattern of development
 9. The appellant also indicates that the proposal would amount to a sustainable form of development. However, I have not been provided with any substantive evidence as to how this might be achieved in this instance. Neither do I consider that the benefits arising from the creation of an additional dwelling would outweigh the adverse impacts which I have identified.
 10. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and there would be material conflict with the aims and requirements of Policies CP2 and CP3 of the Council's Core Strategy and Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD. These policies are most relevant to the proposal and, amongst other things, seek a high standard of design appropriate to its setting, whilst having regard to local character.
 11. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR