



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2022

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/22/3297548

10 Foxglove Road, Rush Green, Barking & Dagenham, Romford, RM7 0YG

- 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 E. Morina against the decision of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00254/HSE dated 18 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character of the estate and terrace row.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end-of-terrace dwellinghouse within a residential area that is of relatively recent construction as an estate. The Council's report notes that due to its modernity little development has taken place on Foxglove Road and I do find this to be the case from my observations at the time of my site visit. This results in a consistent architectural form and the terrace, that the appeal site is part of, is notably symmetrical with each end mirroring the other within a highly visible part of the street scene on Foxglove Road.
4. The notable mirrored feature is the garage/car port, with a pitched roof, to the side of each dwelling at both ends of the terrace row (the appeal site and number 20). The proposal before me would result in the loss of this feature and introduce a new pitched roof form to the roofscape of the dwelling as well as a porch like roof form over the front door. This would unbalance the currently symmetrical terrace row as well as being a contrast to the qualities that create the area in terms of overall character which I find to be uniform and unaltered in design. Overall, the proposal would result in a loss of symmetry to the terrace row and result in uncharacteristic changes to the character of the estate within which it is sited as a result of scale, siting and design.
5. The appellant's statement is based solely upon the proposal being similar to a first floor extension at 29 Campion Close, Rush Green which is stated to be in the adjoining road on the estate. Four photographs have been submitted; however, the photographs do not evidence the design or overall symmetry of the terrace row referred to. No further details have been provided and, from

the location plan before me, it does not appear that Campion Close is in close proximity to the appeal site and is therefore not part of the street scene within which the appeal site stands. Each case must be considered on its own merits.

6. The proposal would be contrary to Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy 2010 Policy CP3 which seeks to ensure high quality standards in relation to design and requires that development respects and strengthens local character. The proposal would also be contrary to Barking and Dagenham Development Plan Document 2011 (DPD) Policy BP11 which requires development to protect or enhance the character of the area.
7. The proposal would be contrary to Barking and Dagenham Draft Local Plan (Reg 19 2020) Policy SP2 which seeks to delivery well-designed, high quality, development, Policy DMD1 which states the Council will support development that make a positive contribution to the character of the surrounding area and Policy DMD6 which requires householder extensions to be designed in an appropriate manner taking into account the Council's latest Supplementary Planning Document. The proposal would be contrary to London Plan 2021 Policy D4 which seeks to deliver good design and the National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 130, which requires that developments add to the overall quality of the area.
8. The proposal would also be contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2012 which notes that all side extensions should be sympathetically designed and reflect the type of house and type of plot. It is further emphasised that attention should be paid to the manner in which proposals are designed and that side extensions have potential to cause significant impact on the character of an area as I have found for this proposal.

Other Matters

9. The Council's refusal reason references DPD Policy BP8, however, this policy relates to residential amenity upon which no refusal reason has been based and I have no evidence before me to conclude differently on this matter.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR