

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2020

**by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 30 October 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/20/3252547**

**121 Church Elm Lane, Dagenham, RM10 9RL**

- 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 Ms Lisa Newton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
  - The application Ref 19/00645/FUL dated 8 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 February 2020.
  - The development proposed is a ground floor side extension with some internal changes.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has raised concerns with how the planning application was dealt with. This is a matter between the appellant and the Council and is beyond the scope of this appeal decision.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey end-terrace dwelling. It is located along Church Elm Lane, where it meets Harrison Road, in a largely residential area and with commercial areas close by.
  5. Housing in the immediate area is characterised by the presence of two storey terraced dwellings on the same side of Church Elm Lane as the appeal property and there is a long three storey block of flats on the opposite side of the street.
  6. The houses and the block of flats are set back from the road, the houses behind short gardens and/or parking areas and the flats behind a low fenced area of green space. The appeal property, like the other dwellings in the same terrace, has a longer garden to the rear.
  7. In addition, the appeal property has a long, narrow garden running along the side of the property, adjacent to Harrison Road. This area of garden comprises a
-

lawn with a low, open wooden fence next to the pavement and is separated from the property's rear garden by a taller wooden fence.

8. The end-terrace dwelling along Church Elm Lane on the opposite side of Harrison Road to the appeal property, Number 123, also has an area of garden running along the side. That area of garden is separated from the pavement by hedge-planting and/or shrubs and similarly to the appeal property, is separated from the rear garden by taller fencing.
9. During my site visit I observed that, together, these two side gardens combine with the presence of wide pavements to provide an attractive sense of symmetry, as well as an open and spacious entrance to Harrison Road from Church Elm Lane; and that the positive contribution made by this entrance area to local character is further enhanced by a strong sense of uniformity, derived from the similar appearance of the appeal property and No 123. Neither dwelling has been extended to the side and both dwellings are of an attractive, matching brick and tile construction.
10. In addition to the above, I also noted during my site visit that the side gardens to the appeal property and No 123 match the set-back of dwellings along Harrison Road, to the further benefit of the area's qualities of uniformity and spaciousness.
11. The single storey side extension proposed would extend across the width of much of the side garden, filling an important gap with built development in a highly prominent street corner location. As a result, the proposal would severely impact upon the uniform and spacious qualities identified above. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated by the erosion of the sense of symmetry with No 123 at the entrance to Harrison Road.
12. The proposal would also introduce a mix of rendering and cladding to both the host property and to the extension. Whilst I noted during my site visit that there are other nearby houses that have been rendered, I find that the loss of the attractive brickwork in this location would further erode the sense of symmetry referred to above. Further, the proposed area of cladding has little precedent in the immediate area and would, I find, draw attention to itself as an incongruous feature, to the detriment of local character.
13. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to DPD<sup>1</sup> policies BP8 and BP11; and to the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which together amongst other things, protect local character.

## **Conclusion**

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

*N McGurk*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011).