
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2021

by **Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 23 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/21/3269733

1B Rose Hatch Avenue, Romford RM6 5NB

- 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 Fazal Rehman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 20/02204/FULL, dated 16 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as erection of a single storey store adjacent to the garage; alterations to the garage door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The development has already been undertaken and this is recognised by the appellant and the Council in their respective statements.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to this semi-detached building which is divided into 2 flats. The building has been extended in the past and also has a detached double garage which was granted by a successful appeal (Ref, APP/Z5060/W/19/3229012).
5. The existing 2 storey side extension has enlarged the building by a considerable amount. The approved double garage is sizeable and, prior to the construction of the appeal proposal, would have been separated from the main building, offering some break in the built form. Although I acknowledge that the extension which is the subject of the appeal is quite modest in itself, the effect that it has is to combine the considerable bulk of the 2 buildings and to remove the visual break between them.
6. In my judgement this means that the resulting building appears uncharacteristically large, cumbersome and visually dominating. This is particularly so when compared to the attached neighbouring property. Even taking account of the existing boundary treatment at the property, I consider

that the proposal has an unacceptable visual effect which is harmful to the surrounding area. In this respect the development is contrary to Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy DPD and Policy BP11 of the Borough Wide DPD.

Conclusion

7. I have taken account of all matters raised in the submissions for this appeal. For the reasons stated, I conclude that the development gives rise to conflict with the policies of the development plan, particularly those set out above and I find nothing to outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR