
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2017

by B Bowker Mplan MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22nd November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3179623
105 Arnold Road, Dagenham RM9 6AN

- 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 H Edebiri against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 17/00714/FUL, dated 2 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and single storey front and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No 105 Arnold Road is a two storey end of terrace dwelling located adjacent the junction of Arnold Road and Combes Road. The full two storey height, width and symmetrical hipped roof design of the appeal property visually contrasts and 'bookends' the wider terrace in an attractive manner. This is a design feature evident at nearby terraces and contributes to a pleasant and ordered character in the surrounding area.
4. The height, width and overall mass of the proposed extension would obscure the bookend design of the appeal property. In addition, the irregular shape and multiple roof slopes proposed would be out of character with the symmetrical and simpler design of the roof along the host property, the wider terrace, and those in the surrounding area. Thus, as a whole, the design and scale of the proposal would appear incongruous with the host building and the wider terrace, to the detriment of the established ordered character in the surrounding area.
5. The resultant harm would be noticeable from public vantage points along Arnold Road, including the junction at Combes Road. The use of matching roof, wall and window materials would not prevent the harm identified above. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document states that side extensions should be particularly sympathetic in

terms of their form and roof treatment. Based on my reasoning above, the proposal would be deficient in this respect.

6. In reaching this view I understand that the Council have previously granted permission¹ for a side extension at the appeal property. Full details of this permission are not before me. However, based on the Council's description, the previous permission relates to a side extension with a reduced scale and more sympathetic design. Consequently it is materially different to the proposal before me. Moreover I must determine the appeal before me on its own individual merits.
7. Therefore the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Consequently the proposal would be contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document. Combined these policies require development to protect or enhance local character and help create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge that the Council concluded that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of occupants at neighbouring properties. However an absence of harm in this respect is a neutral factor, and as such would not outweigh the harm identified in relation to the main issue above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having taken all matters raised into account, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

B Bowker
INSPECTOR

¹ Council Ref 16/01888/FUL