



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 August 2021

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

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

Decision date: 27 August 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/21/3273007
74 Ford Road, Dagenham, RM10 9JP

- 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 Fatlum Smajlaj against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 20/02539/HSE, dated 21/12/2020, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as '*retension of front dormer, part front extension and relocation of parking and work to front and side driveway*' (sic).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Appellant has provided some detail of a withdrawn (by the Council) enforcement notice. However, the scheme before me is subject to Section 78 of the TCPA and I have considered it in this context. I have also taken into account the other aspects of the history of the appeal site as set out in the cases of the main parties.
3. The Appellant indicates, exercising the 'Wheatcroft' principle, that the parking arrangements sought and shown on the submitted drawings are not sought as part of the appeal scheme. Concerns over this matter form the third reason for refusal. However, given that this is no longer sought from the scheme, I have not considered this matter any further.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within a residential area of Dagenham. Typically the street scene is characterised along both Ford Road and Broad Street by short rows of terraced houses. I saw during my site inspection that, in the main, the street scene is generally devoid of projecting porch or front extensions. Moreover, where projections to the roof are visible, these generally take the form of small scale, planned dormers (as seen on Ford Road opposite the appeal site).
6. As noted in the Appellant's appeal statement, there are some limited examples of large, visually dominant dormers in roof slopes – such as that on the corner

- of Ford Road and Armstead Walk. However, these are generally incongruous and visually distracting features within the locality, where most dwellings have retained the original architectural form and style.
7. The large monopitch single storey extension facing Ford Road appears as an incongruous addition to the two-storey domestic scale end of terrace dwelling. This is exacerbated when viewed in light of the single storey extension to the side (when looking from Ford Road), the oddly misaligned and non-centred front dormer, and the large boxy rear dormer that drawing PL09 labelled 'Proposed Elevations' shows would have windows in each end (facing the triangle of green space at Broad Street and Ford Road and the opposite end). Furthermore, the use of non-matching materials such as grey cladding material for the roof extensions, detracts from the both the host building and the wider built form in this residential area.
 8. The overall incongruent nature of the extensions for which permission are sought would therefore be at odds with prevailing pattern of development within the locality. As such, I find that the scheme before me would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area.
 9. I note that the Appellant points to elements of the scheme which may benefit from permitted development rights: therefore not requiring planning permission. However, my remit is to consider the proposal before me as detailed in the submitted drawings. In itself, this does not address or overcome the adverse impacts of the scheme before me, nor provide justification for its approval in this instance.
 10. Accordingly, it would be contrary to Policies CP2 and CP3 of the *LDF Core Strategy July 2010* and Policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the *LDF Borough Wide Development Plan Document 2011*, which amongst other aims seek to ensure that all developments have regard to the local character of the area and help to create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place. This are similarly reflected within policies contained in the *London Plan* and those contained within the National Planning Policy Framework ,which seek similar aims.
 11. I therefore find that the appeal scheme is contrary to the adopted development plan for the area when considered as a whole, and there are no material considerations that indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with it.
 12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Parker

INSPECTOR