



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2023

by Nick Bowden BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/23/3321608

16 Marston Avenue, Dagenham RM10 7JX

- 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 Irfan Mohammed against the decision of the Council for the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 23/00005/HSE, dated 2 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2023.
 - The development is a proposed 2 storey side and single storey rear and front porch and loft extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The existing dwelling is the end terrace property along a row of four within a predominantly residential area. This row of dwellings are of similar individual design featuring pebble dash and tile hanging to front bays. They have undergone relatively minimal alterations with the most obvious being the addition of front porches. Differing facing materials, new windows and replacement roof tiles have also been introduced, as is the case with the majority, if not all homes along Marston Avenue. These alterations have not altered the overall balance and rhythm of the terrace. The proposed extension would have a width and depth comparable to that of the existing dwelling. The side extension would be set at a slightly lower ridge line with a modest set back of the front wall at first floor level from the principal elevation. The ground floor element would align with the current front porch and replace an existing outbuilding.
4. The extension would not reflect the form of the existing row of terraces and, due to its width and associated bulk and massing, would notably unbalance its symmetry. It would not read as a subordinate addition to the existing dwelling and fails to adhere to the detailed guidance given in the Barking and Dagenham Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPG) for extensions to terraces. The extension does not accord with this guidance as it nearly doubles the width of the building. It is not parallel with the front elevation as it is recessed at first floor level and aligns with the porch, which is a subordinate entrance structure, at ground floor level.

5. The dormer window in the rear roof slope would be sufficiently modest within the resultant roof slope such that it would not be excessively large or dominate the overall form. However, the hip to gable side extension would unbalance the symmetry of the row. The dormer and rooflights forming part of the proposed loft conversion are dependent on the remainder of the extension. Those elements require the extended dwelling to have an acceptable design to integrate satisfactorily. A hip to gable extension would, equally, and of itself, have an unbalancing effect on the row of terraces. Nevertheless, the single storey rear element is of a shallow depth. This fits comfortably within the limits the SPG allows for and would not contribute to the harm to the appearance of the host dwelling or row that I have otherwise identified.
6. In reaching the above findings, I have had regard to previous refusals (Council refs 18/00138/FUL and 19/01149/FUL), the more recent of which was dismissed at appeal (ref APP/Z5060/W/21/3272123). I note that both these schemes were for the formation of an end-terrace dwelling. Indeed, the latter was not denied permission due to design reasons. Its form more closely replicated that of the existing row of terraces, albeit with features that read a new dwelling. That scheme is not the same as the one presently in hand. I have, therefore, determined this appeal proposal on its own merits.
7. Other extensions in the locality have also been drawn to my attention. The extension to number 2 Marston Avenue is a good example of an extension that matches the form and features of the host row of terraces. It benefits from the matching ridge line and neatly aligned front elevation to both floors together with narrower width and space to side boundary. In this regard it is materially different to the development proposed here.
8. Numbers 76 and 78 are notably different and should not be seen as setting a precedent for similar extensions nor the harm I have identified as those examples appear dominant and incongruous in the street scene. I do not have details on the full context of these cases, including the applicable policies and guidance at the time of their construction. I am therefore unable to give them significant weight in this assessment. In any case, their existence does not justify the harm that would arise from this proposal.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area, as it would not relate satisfactorily to the existing dwelling and would unbalance the symmetry of the row of terraces. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policy CP3 of the Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy (2010), Policy BP11 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Management Plan (2011) and the associated guidance in the SPG. The policies aim to protect or enhance the character and amenity of the area and are consistent with the related provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. The Council has also cited Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD6 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Draft Local Plan in its decision. I note that the draft plan is at Examination, and therefore at an advanced stage. However, at the current time it does not form part of the statutory development plan and I have not been made aware as to whether there are any unresolved objections in relation to the noted policies. I can, therefore, only attach limited weight to

those policies in this decision and, as such, they are not an influential factor on the outcome of this appeal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Bowden

INSPECTOR