

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2022

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/22/3306334
5 Wood Lane, Dagenham, RM8 3ND

- 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 Munir Ahmad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 22/00933/HSE dated 28 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is a front porch with pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal property benefits from a recent planning permission¹ for the "construction of a small front porch with a pitch roof." The proposal the subject of this appeal is for a larger front porch.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey mid-terrace dwelling extended at roof level and to the rear. It is located in a residential area and is situated along Wood Lane in a prominent position, close to Wood Lane's junction with Bennett's Castle Lane and opposite Wood Lane's junction with Martin Road.
5. The area is largely characterised by the presence of short rows of two-storey terraced houses of broadly similar design, set back from the road behind short gardens and/or parking areas and with longer gardens to the rear.
6. During my site visit, I observed that, whilst many dwellings have been altered and/or extended, the similarities in their overall appearance resulting from the rhythm of development, the common use of similar materials, the predominant presence of hipped roofs to end-dwellings, the regular appearance of gaps

¹ Reference: 22/0399/HSE.

between rows of dwellings and the presence of modest porches or canopies above front doors, provides for a pleasant sense of uniformity.

7. The row of terraced houses within which the appeal property is located presents many of these uniform features. Notably, there is an absence of any large porches to the front elevation of any of the dwellings in the terrace.
8. Whilst the appeal property benefits from a permission for the development of a porch, this is for a modest addition. In contrast, the proposed development is for a larger porch that would project forwards for some considerable depth. I find that the dimensions of the proposal are such that it would result in the development of a porch of such scale that it would appear as an incongruous feature – out of keeping with the uniform qualities of the terrace.
9. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the appeal property's prominent location, such that the proposal would draw undue attention to itself as an incongruent development widely visible in its surroundings.
10. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to London Plan (2021) Policies D1, D4 and D8; to DPD² policy BP11; to Core Strategy³ Policy CP3; and to the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

11. In support of his case, the appellant draws attention to other developments in the area. However, as noted above, the proposal would result in harm to its immediate surroundings. Whilst there are examples of other porches elsewhere in the wider area, this is not a factor that mitigates the harm identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

² Reference: Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011).

³ Reference: Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy (2010).