
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2019

by Ian Harrison BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/19/3229062
150 Ford Road, Dagenham RM9 6LR

- 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 Aamin Bukhari against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 18/01087/FUL, dated 16 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 26 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is a part single part double storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the list of plans that appears on the application decision notice, the Council have clarified that the plans submitted and considered as part of the planning application were L 100 A, L 101 A, L 102 A, L 103 A, L 104 A and L105 A. I shall proceed on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The site is located within a residential area that comprises of terraced and semi-detached dwellings in a formal layout. The dwellings of the area are not uniform in appearance, but there are a number of architectural features that appear regularly. The street trees of Dagenham Avenue, the architecture and the layout create a strongly defined character. This is reflected by the dwelling at the appeal site which is one of 4 similar dwellings at the junction of Dagenham Avenue and Ford Road, the spacing around which enables the dwellings to have some prominence. The front and side elevations of the dwellings and their detailing, particularly the brickwork above the windows on the side elevations, are significant features of the dwellings.
5. The extension would unbalance the pair of dwellings and interrupt the consistency of the 4 dwellings to a greater degree than any previous alterations that appear to have occurred. The extension would also reduce the space between dwellings at first floor level, in which the trees of Dagenham Avenue

can partially be seen. This would detract from the contribution that the dwelling and the layout make to the character of the area.

6. Several nearby extensions have been brought to my attention by the appellant and I have witnessed other extensions within the locality. These extensions have replicated or complimented the existing architectural features of the locality or been discretely located and as such the character of the area has not been undermined. However, the dual roof of the extension proposed would be poorly integrated with the host dwelling and would result in the extension having a contrived appearance that would conflict with the form of the host dwelling. The other developments and their settings do not appear to be identical and as such the effect on the character and appearance of the area is not directly comparable.
7. It has been suggested that the proposal is an improvement in comparison to a previously refused application and that the extension aligns with a former garage. I have not seen any previous proposals or details of a garage, but do not consider that these details would alter the assessment of the proposal or alter the harm that has been identified.
8. The Council state that the site is part of the Becontree Estate which is specifically mentioned within policies CP2 of the Core Strategy 2010¹ and BP2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD 2011². I have been provided with no detail of the extent of the Becontree Estate and can therefore give this matter minimal weight. Nevertheless, the inclusion of the site within a non-designated heritage asset would not reduce the significance of the harm identified and therefore this does not alter my conclusion in respect of the main issue.
9. I therefore conclude that the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area contrary to policy CP3 of the Core Strategy 2010 and policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD 2011 which require that development has regard to and protects local character, helps to create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place and provides attractive, high quality architecture.

Conclusion

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

Ian Harrison

INSPECTOR

¹ Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham – Core Strategy (July 2010)

² Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham – Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011)