



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by Ian Harrison BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/19/3232697

44 Bull Lane, Dagenham RM10 7HA

- 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 Andrey Krutikov against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 19/00528/FUL, dated 21 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension to create a new end of terrace 2 bedroom house with associated landscaping and one car parking place accessed from Bull Lane.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Bull Lane is characterised by featuring dwellings to one side and a commercial area to the other, which is partially masked from the public domain by trees, fencing and a wall. The dwellings are arranged into short terraces of not more than 6 dwellings, with pairs of dwellings within the terrace featuring mirrored 2 storey forward projections. The terraces are set back by a generally consistent amount which provides space for frontage car parking and landscaping.
4. Tannery Close is located adjacent to the appeal site and is fronted by a 2 and 3 storey building that contains flats, the side elevation of which faces Bull Lane and is of similar alignment as the front elevation of the Bull Lane dwellings. This building arrangement is repeated to both sides of Sparrow Green which is further along Bull Lane. The positioning of the built form relative to Bull Lane creates a degree of spaciousness and uniformity that contributes positively to the suburban character of the area. The consistency of the design of the terraced dwellings and the rhythm of their 2 storey forward projections is also an important feature of the area.
5. The appeal site is located at the junction of Bull Lane and Tannery Close and contains an end-terrace, two storey dwelling that is set back from both roads. The dwelling has a side and rear garden that is larger than the other dwellings within the terrace. The proposal would see the erection of a dwelling to the side of the existing dwelling with the plot divided to create front and rear

gardens that are comparable to those in the remainder of the terrace. A single storey projection is proposed to the rear and a 2 storey forward projection would be to one side of the front elevation.

6. As set out above, the setback of the built form from the roads of Bull Lane and Tannery Close plays an important role in defining the character of the area. The proposal would see the loss of most of the space to the side of the existing dwelling and the erection of a dwelling that would be closer to a road than any other dwelling within the vicinity of the site. The development would, therefore, erode the spaciousness of the plot and its contribution to the character of the area. Whilst a small gap would be retained to the side of the dwelling, this would not be sufficient to avoid the dwelling appearing dominant at the junction, in a manner that contrasts and conflicts with the established pattern of development in the locality.
7. Although the dwelling would partially replicate the scale and appearance of the existing buildings within the terrace, the 2 storey forward projection would be narrower than the comparable projections as it would not be mirrored at a neighbouring property. There are no other forward projections at the end of any of the terraces within Bull Lane and as such this element of the proposal would disrupt the pattern and rhythm of the arrangement of the dwellings, to the detriment of the appearance of the street.
8. The development would therefore have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. As such the proposal is contrary to policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD¹ which require that development has regard to the layout and design of buildings and the character of the local area in order to create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place. The proposal is also contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (2016) which seek, amongst other things, that development has regard to the form, function and structure of an area and the pattern and grain of existing spaces and streets, whilst also reinforcing the unique local character of a neighbourhood.

Other Matters

9. Whilst the appellant has made the case that the site is well connected to services and infrastructure, no unacceptable harm would be caused to the living conditions of neighbouring residents and parking and adequate living conditions would be provided for future occupants, these considerations do not mitigate or outweigh the visual harm that has been identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Ian Harrison

INSPECTOR

¹ Planning for the future of Barking and Dagenham. Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011)