



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2020

by Mark Caine BSc (Hons) MTPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16/02/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/20/3251791
84 Lodge Avenue, Dagenham, RM8 2JP

- 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 Islam Sedaj against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 20/00297/FUL, dated 2 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'double storey side extension, part single/part first floor rear extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit the construction of the single storey rear extension had begun but had not been completed. For the avoidance of doubt I confirm that my determination of the appeal is based on the drawings submitted.
3. The Council has referred to policies in the Draft Local Plan (DLP) in its reason for refusal. However, the DLP is at an early stage in its preparation and has not been formally adopted. Therefore, whilst I have had regard to these policies in my determination of this appeal, in accordance with paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I have given them limited weight as material considerations.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, terrace row and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to a two-storey end terrace house that is situated within a predominantly residential area. The overriding character of the immediate vicinity is of tightly knit terrace rows with hipped roofs. However, the appeal site is also located adjacent to a car parking area associated with Barking Football Club. This results in its gable elevation and roof form being relatively exposed and readily apparent along Lodge Avenue.
6. The Council has not raised any objection to the change in the original dwelling's roof form from a hipped to a ridge and gable design as they consider that it

- would be acceptable as permitted development. I also appreciate that the proposal would be constructed in materials to match the existing dwelling.
7. Nonetheless, there is a general uniformity in the design and layout of the neighbouring terrace rows, which provide simple, continuous, and balanced buildings. The proposed first floor set back and the lowered roof ridge height of the side extension element of the proposal, together with the proposed gable roof design, would further pronounce the unbalanced and jarring appearance of the appeal dwelling.
 8. Furthermore, the size and scale of the first floor rear extension element of the proposal, in combination with that of the proposed side extension, the existing rear dormer and the approved single storey rear extension, and their varying roof forms, would provide significant additional visual bulk and dominance to the dwelling and the terrace row.
 9. The appeal site's relatively exposed position next to Barking Football Club's car park is such that the discordant nature of the proposal would be plainly visible when approaching from the north of Lodge Avenue and from the windows of neighbouring properties.
 10. As a result of these factors the proposal would thereby not respect or maintain the built form of the terrace of which the appeal dwelling is a part of, but would instead appear dominant, disproportionate and incongruous in relation to the surrounding built environment.
 11. I therefore find that the proposed development would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, terrace row, and the surrounding area. As such it would conflict with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011), and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016. Taken together, these seek, amongst other things, high quality design that sensitively responds to local character.
 12. For the reasons given above, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Mark Caine

INSPECTOR