
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by Cullum J A Parker BA(Hons) MA MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/20/3255941

97 Woodward Road, Dagenham, RM9 4ST

- 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 Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 19/01680/FUL, dated 30 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'demolition of side annex and erection of one bedroom dwelling house to 97 Woodward Road, RM9 4ST'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site, 97 Woodward Road, is an end of terrace, two storey dwelling, located on the junction of Woodward Road and Flamstead Road and within the Beaconsfield Estate. The street scene is typified by a planned layout, with each corner dwelling on this junction having a noticeable gap between the flank of the dwelling and the junction.
4. Permission is sought for the demolition of a single storey side extension and its replacement with a two storey side extension with a significantly larger footprint. Due to the width and depth of the proposed dwelling, the ground floor of the proposal would occupy the gap between the flank wall of 97 Woodward Road and the edge of the pavement as shown in the submitted drawings. This would be further compounded by the, in the main, two storey height of the proposed development and lack of any discernible step back from the junction.
5. As a result, the proposed development would erode the open nature of this part of the Beaconsfield Estate and be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development. As such it would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find that it would be contrary to policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Brough Wide DPD 2011, which amongst other aims seek to ensure all developments have regard to the local character of the area and help create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place.

6. The Appellant has drawn my attention to the space between No 97 Woodward Road and 19 Hamleton Terrace/Flamstead Road and that that fact provides support to the proposal. However, this fails to appreciate that it is the spaciousness of the junction itself in relation to the other three end of terrace dwellings that would be lost.
7. I note reference to other examples that the Appellant considers are 'precedents'. I do not have the full details of how those examples arose. Nevertheless, their contexts appear to differ from that before me – for example being at the head of a cul-de-sac. They do not, therefore, provide justification for addressing or overcoming the harm I have identified in relation to the appeal site and its immediate context.
8. Lastly, I note the Appellant's concerns relating to the Council's handling of their application. However that is a separate matter to that before me, which does not alter my consideration of the planning merits of the appeal scheme.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not accord with the adopted development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with it.
10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Cullum J A Parker

INSPECTOR