



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2021 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/21/3278270

28 Oglethorpe Road, Dagenham, RM10 7RX

- 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 Ms Adeladja Allaraj against the decision of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00288/HSE, dated 16 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a new front porch and two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey end of terrace dwelling located within the Becontree Estate which comprises a large residential area strongly characterised by small blocks of symmetrical short terraces, semi-detached housing, wide verges and small open spaces. The visual gaps between the blocks of terraces contribute a sense of spaciousness to the area. The appeal property lies at the entrance of a cul-de-sac which is typified by a distinctive symmetrical layout.
 5. Whilst I accept that the proposed development would utilise sympathetic materials and aligned fenestration, the two-storey side extension would appear excessively bulky given its significant height and width. It would not appear sufficiently subservient and would overwhelm the host dwelling. The proposal would constitute a dominant and incongruous addition.
 6. Though I note that the proposal would be set down from the ridge and back from the front elevation of the dwelling, the overall building line would be brought forward by the single storey front extension which would add considerable bulk to the dwelling, given its significant width across almost the
-

entire front elevation. Therefore, the proposal would unduly increase the prominence of the dwelling in the street scene.

7. Furthermore, the altered roof profile, with the added hipped element, would jar with the terrace as a whole, as well as with the other blocks of terraces in the vicinity which have all maintained their original roofscapes and coherent roof lines. The combination of the front extension and the proposed two-storey extension would result in a dwelling that would be out of scale with the surrounding context, and which would imbalance the terrace within which it is situated. The added built form would also erode the symmetrical character of the cul-de-sac and reduce the spaciousness of this end-of-terrace plot resulting in an adverse impact on the open character of the streetscene. The remaining separation gap, which is a key characteristic of the area, between the appeal dwelling and the neighbouring property at No.30 would be significantly eroded and the proposal would appear visually intrusive in this respect.
8. Whilst the appellant makes reference to the existence of a number of other properties which could be considered similar, each case must be determined on its individual merits and the circumstances in each case are likely to be different. For example, though I acknowledge No. 68 Oglethorpe Road features a two-storey side extension, it does not lie within a prominent corner plot situated at the entrance of a cul-de-sac defined by strong building lines and spaciousness. It is therefore not directly comparable to the proposal before me. Similarly, my attention has been drawn to other developments in the surrounding area. No. 18 Oglethorpe Road features a two-storey side extension, however, it appears to have maintained the original roof form and symmetrical character of the terrace it forms part of, has not adversely impacted the character and appearance of the area and therefore is not comparable to the proposal. The other extension referred to by the appellant, at No.133 Downing Road, also differs in context and has not unreasonably impacted the spaciousness and open character of the streetscene. I have not therefore attributed any significant weight to these references in my decision making.
9. Given the above, the proposed dwelling would constitute an incongruous development and would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy CP3 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (the 'Core Strategy'), Policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Plan Document (the 'local plan'), Policies D1, D4 & D8 of the London Plan, emerging Policies SP2, SP4, DMD1, DMD6 of the Council's Draft Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation version (the 'emerging local plan'), the 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Together these seek the delivery of well-designed developments respectful of local context. The development would also conflict with Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy, Policy BP2 of the local plan, Policy HC1 of the London Plan and draft Policy DMD4 of the emerging local plan which together seek to ensure non-designated locally distinctive and historically important areas, such as the Becontree Estate, are preserved and enhanced.

Other Matters

10. The appellant states that the proposal would adhere to national planning policy on the effective use of land in meeting the need for homes. Whilst I accept

that the development would allow for additional accommodation, it would also have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. The provision of a single enlarged dwelling would not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Recommendation

11. The development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
12. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L J O'Brien

INSPECTOR