



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2020

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 January 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/20/3252450
60 Rose Lane, Romford RM6 5JU

- 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 Victoria Bedwell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 19/01942/FUL, dated 17 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is for a ground and first floor extension and loft conversion.
-

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 dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a 2-storey, mid-terrace dwelling in a high-density, urban situation. The surrounding area either side of this part of Rose Lane comprises a mixture of building styles and designs, including semi-detached and terraced properties.
4. The first floor rear element of the proposal would incorporate an angled elevation, a feature that has presumably been introduced in order to protect the living conditions of the occupants of the adjoining property. This wedge-shape at first floor level would be clearly visible from the private amenity spaces of surrounding properties. To my mind the design would lack architectural subtlety, and together with the combination of various roof pitches and heights would not be cohesive or balanced, failing to reflect the character and appearance of the host property and representing a harmful intrusion into the neighbourhood.
5. At my site visit my attention was drawn to completed extensions to a house at the rear, which is evident from the appellant's rear garden area and others in the vicinity. Notwithstanding that each application should be dealt with on its merits, I note that this property is an end-terrace dwelling with a gap to one side, which allows for the first floor element to square-off without the need for any incongruous angled elevations or varied roof formations. As such the development does not compare to the appeal proposal before me.

6. I am satisfied from the plan showing the proposed rear elevation of the scheme that the first floor element would have a pitched roof. Consequently there would be no conflict with the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document February 2012. The Council raises no objection to the proposed dormer window, which appears to be of an acceptable scale and design, and I have no reason to disagree.
7. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. There would be conflict with policies BP8 and BP11 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document March 2011, which require development to have regard to the local character of the area provide attractive, high-quality architecture.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge that the internal layout would provide space for the appellant and her family and result in a negligible impact on the amenities of neighbouring dwellings. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm that I have identified previously.

Conclusion

9. Based on the arguments above, I dismiss the appeal.

C Hall

INSPECTOR