
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/25/3358999

78A Fourth Avenue, Romford, RM7 0UD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 24/01502/HSE.
 - The development proposed is construction of a two storey side extension and a part two storey part single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a two-storey side extension and a part two storey part single storey rear extension at 78A Fourth Avenue, Romford, RM7 0UD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01502/HSE, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: JND/1418/32, JND/1418/33, JND/1417/34, JND/1418/35.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector 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 proposed two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Fourth Avenue is a residential road characterised by two storey terraced dwellings on typically long narrow plots with either single or shared projecting front gables with hipped roofs. There is a strong building line with wide pavements set alongside the roads within the estate which it was observed are used informally for vehicular parking.

5. The appeal site is situated in a prominent corner position on the junction with Fourth Avenue and Leonard Avenue. The rear garden is parallel with Leonard Avenue and is enclosed with a high brick wall and close boarded fencing boundary treatment. There is an existing gap between the side elevation of the appeal dwelling and the boundary treatment. The appeal dwelling has a pebble dashed finish.
6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' 2012 states that, '*corner plot properties are particularly prominent parts of the street scene and often help to reduce the sense of enclosure. On particularly prominent corners, extensions should not normally extend beyond the adjacent building line which shares the junction and extensions which do not comply maybe considered overly intrusive in the street scene and often considered unacceptable*'. The SPD further states that with a terrace property, the '*front elevation should be parallel with the front elevation of the existing house to help maintain the built form of the terrace which the house is a part of*'.
7. The Council has raised no objection to the detailed design when considered in isolation of the part two storey, part single storey rear extensions, with the principal focus of dispute on the design impact of the two storey side extension. However, it is clear that the Council retain concerns over the cumulative impact of the entirety of the proposed development.
8. Cumulatively, the proposed extensions will significantly increase the overall scale, massing and footprint of the host dwelling. However, I'm satisfied that the combined visual impact would be relatively limited, given the design of the extensions which integrate into the character and appearance of the host dwelling and therefore would not be harmful to the street scene.
9. The proposed side extension would measure 3.6 metres in width and would be set flush with the front gabled elevation of the existing dwelling. It would create a wider gable, mimicking the character of the shared gabled frontages evident in the terraces within the street scene. The proposed side extension would have a width that would be more than half of the width of the existing terraced dwelling, albeit by a modest amount. The existing building and plot are of a sufficient size to accommodate the addition without it appearing disproportionately large and overly prominent.
10. The existing gap to the side of the dwelling provides limited contribution to the sense of spaciousness and openness within the street scene given the boundary treatment that encloses the rear/side garden. Whilst the first floor element of the two storey extension would be notably visible, I observed during my site visit that at no. 80 Fourth Avenue, on the opposite side of Leonard Avenue, a two-storey side extension of a similar scale to that proposed, has been constructed abutting the pavement, which I note has not been shown on the submitted block plan. The proposal would provide a degree of symmetry at the junction of Leonard Avenue and Fourth Avenue, reflecting the two storey extension opposite and providing better balance within the street scene.
11. I am satisfied that the proposed development would not create a sense of overbearing along Leonard Avenue, particularly given the existing wide pavements which contribute to the openness within the estate. I also note that the side

elevation of the existing dwelling is already set forwards of the building line for the adjacent terrace along Leonard Avenue (No. 31-39) and therefore the proposal would not have a significantly greater impact on the street scene in terms of the resultant prominence.

12. I note that planning permission had previously been granted by the Council at the appeal site for a *'two storey side extension and part single/part two storey rear extension and loft conversion involving construction of rear dormer window'* (reference 17/00941/FUL). However, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, this permission appears to no longer be extant, with no indication of an implementation of this previous scheme. This has not therefore had any significant bearing on the determination of the appeal.
13. For the reasons given above, I find that the appeal scheme would not be dominant or visually discordant in terms of its surroundings and would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, street scene or the short terrace of dwellings which the appeal building is a component of. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policies D1, D4 of the London Plan (March 2021), Policies SP2, DMD1, DMD5 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Local Plan (September 2024) and the Residential Extension and Alterations SPD which seek to achieve high quality design and development that respects and complements the character of the area.

Conditions

14. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to commencement of development and a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
15. In the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, a condition requiring the external materials of the extension to match those used in the existing building/dwelling is imposed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to conditions.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR