



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2020

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/19/3243586

328 Goresbrook Road, Dagenham RM9 6XX

- 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 Ismet Limani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 19/01392/FUL, dated 23 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as: 'resubmission – proposed double storey side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for proposed double storey side extension and single storey rear extension at 328 Goresbrook Road, Dagenham RM9 6XX in accordance with application ref: 19/01392/FUL dated 23 August 2019, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby approved shall commence within 3 years of the date of this approval;
 - 2) The development hereby approved shall be implemented strictly in accordance with drawing numbers: 300, 301 revision A, 302, 303 revision A, 304 and 305 revision A.

Procedural Matters

2. In allowing the appeal, I have amended the description of development by removing the word 'resubmission' and including reference to the single storey rear extension. This is in the interests of precision and because a resubmission is not an act of development, nor is it relevant to my assessment of the appeal.
3. The submitted drawings show the appeal site as having a hipped roof. However, when undertaking my site visit, it was apparent that the hipped roof had been converted to a gable end. Despite this, I am required to determine the proposal on the basis of the evidence before me. I have done this accordingly, and the presence of the hip to gable conversion has had no bearing on my findings in relation to the appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is an end of terrace dwelling. When viewed from the road, to the right of the appeal site is another terrace of dwellings. These terraces are separated by a gap between the buildings and the adjacent terrace is set back further from the highway than the appeal site. This staggered arrangement of terraced blocks of housing is a common feature along the road. The houses are consistent in form and appearance, but the terraces are punctuated by small gaps and steps in the building line. These gaps and setbacks provide articulation and uniformity to the street scene and consequently, make a positive contribution to the locality.
6. The proposal would introduce a two storey extension to the side of the existing dwelling. This would have the effect of reducing the space between the appeal building and its adjacent neighbour. However, the first floor element of the proposal would be substantially set back from the front of the house. The extension would also be demonstrably narrow when viewed in the context of the existing building and would introduce a hipped roof with a substantially lower ridge height. The form, mass and scale of the proposed extension would ensure that it would be suitably respectful to the existing building. In addition, due to its slender width, limited ridge height, and generous set back at first floor level, I am satisfied that the proposal would also maintain much of the space between the appeal building and the neighbouring property. In doing this, the proposal would respect and be complementary to the established rhythm found within the street scene.
7. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011) as well as advice contained within the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012). Taken together, these seek amongst other things, sensitive design that responds to local character.

Conclusion

8. In light of my findings set out above, conditions are necessary in the interests of precision to establish the time limit for commencing development, as well as the approved drawings. Subject to these matters, the appeal should be allowed and planning permission be granted.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR