



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2019

by Conor Rafferty LLB (Hons), AIEMA, Solicitor (Non-practising)

Decision by Chris Preston BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 May 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/19/3238210

1 Lynnett Road, Dagenham, RM8 1RJ

- 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 A Kamberi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 19/01091/FUL, dated 25 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located on the corner junction of Lynnett Road and Lymington Road and comprises an end of terrace property. The surrounding area is characterised by its residential nature, with a high level of consistency among the dwellings in terms of style and scale. The appeal site forms part of a row of three dwellings where an obvious and pleasing sense of symmetry exists due to the entrance for both end properties being located on the side elevation, with the middle property entrance marking the centre point of the terrace. There is no evidence of any previous extensions to the group from the front elevation and the terraces contribute positively to the character of the residential area.
5. A sense of coherence also exists between the appeal site and the property on the opposite side of Lynnett Road. Both dwellings comprise end of terrace properties which benefit from relatively large garden space on prominent corner plots. The layout of the surrounding estate was carefully planned as is evident in the symmetry between different blocks and the regular spacing between properties. The open spaces at the corners between different blocks and streets is an integral part of that character. They are set back from the neighbouring properties on Lymington Road,

where a gap between the dwellings when viewed from Lynnett Road provides a visual break in built development, distinguishing the two streets.

6. The proposed development relates to a two storey side extension. It has been designed in an attempt to match the existing property by using similar materials. Nonetheless, the scale of the proposal would introduce a feature to the dwelling that would not respect the current character and proportions of the property or the surrounding area. The proposal represents a significant addition to the modest dwelling, which would appear as overly dominant in the context of both the scale of the appeal property and the layout of the wider estate as described above.
7. Views of the proposal would be particularly prominent on entering or exiting Lynnett Road at the junction with Lymington Road, where the corner plot location allows the appeal property to be experienced in the context of the neighbouring dwellings. The symmetry that exists along the front elevation of this row of terraced houses is a defining feature in the group of properties, but the extension would greatly reduce this sense of coherence. The proposal would not only extend the footprint of the appeal property so as to render the terraces unsymmetrical by nature of the scale and shape of the dwellings, but it would also involve the relocation of the entrance door to the front elevation, further reducing the overall consistency of this group of properties. Accordingly, the proposal would appear as an incongruous addition to the streetscape.
8. Furthermore, as a consequence of the proposal the appeal site would no longer mirror the property on the opposite side of Lynnett Road. It would extend into the garden space present on the site and when viewed from the front elevation would reduce the visual gap present between the appeal property and the Lymington Road dwelling. These aspects of the proposal would render the appeal property visually distinct from that across the road, further adding to the sense that it is out of place in the immediate location, upsetting the current settlement pattern and failing to have regard to the character and distinctiveness of the immediate area.
9. For all of those reasons the proposal would be contrary to the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, adopted February 2012 (the SPD) which states, amongst other things, that an extension which results in the loss of an important gap between buildings will be considered unacceptable and that extensions on prominent corner plots should not extend beyond the adjacent building line which shares the junction so as to respect the character of the area.
10. For the reasons given above I also find that the development would have a significantly adverse visual effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would fail to comply with Policies BP8 and BP11 of Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document, adopted March 2011 and the SPD.

Other considerations

11. The appellant has stated that the proposal is similar to other developments on Lynnett Road. However, no further detail has been provided on these developments or their comparability to the current scheme. In any event, the appeal is to be decided on its own site-specific circumstances and the symmetry between the property and neighbouring dwellings remains largely intact as observed at my site visit.

12. The appellant has further argued that the proposal was submitted to the Council prior to a change of policy and should have been considered under the old policies. However, no further information has been provided in support of this argument and in any event the appeal is to be determined on the basis of the policy that is currently in place.
13. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that there are no objections to the proposal from the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. However, this is not sufficient to outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. Having had regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Preston

INSPECTOR