



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by E Everitt BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/25/3372769

28 Legon Avenue, Rush Green, Romford RM7 0UL

- 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 I Uz-Zaman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 25/00788/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as 'double storey side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Legon Avenue and surrounding roads comprise a mix of terraced and semi-detached residential properties. The surrounding area includes a variety of property styles, some of which have been modified. However, the terrace of which the appeal site forms part is largely unaltered along the Legon Avenue frontage except for small-scale changes such as the addition of porches and changes to glazing, including the introduction of rooflights where roofs have been converted. As a result, the terrace largely retains its original character and a uniform appearance.
4. The appeal proposal would result in the substantial expansion of the existing dwelling, which has previously been extended to the rear at ground floor level and through a hip-to-gable enlargement with rear dormer. The enlarged dwelling would be at odds with the remainder of the terrace which, as set out above, is in largely original form on the Legon Avenue frontage. It would be highly visible due to its location on a corner plot at an entrance to Central Park and opposite Fourth Avenue.
5. Taken together with its scale, the form of the appeal proposal, which would depart from the rectilinear pattern of development along Legon Avenue, would result in the dwelling becoming overly dominant within the street scene.
6. The set back of the first floor and the lower ridge height would result in the proposed extension not appearing as part of the terrace and instead forming an incongruous addition. The set back would be inconsistent with the guidance on

extensions to terrace houses within the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2012). In this regard, the appeal proposal would interrupt the consistency of the terrace and alter its character.

7. I acknowledge that external materials matching those of the existing dwelling would be used. However, this would not overcome the harm identified above.
8. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, it would fail to comply with the relevant provisions of Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD5 of The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Local Plan (2024) and Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021). These policies, in summary, seek development which relates to local context, makes a positive contribution to the character of the surrounding area and respects and complements the appearance of the original house and group of buildings of which it forms a part.

Other Matters

9. A number of letters in support of the proposed development from neighbouring residents were provided by the appellant alongside their appeal statement. These letters comment on the detrimental impact of the existing garage on the character of the street and the improvements which would result from the proposal, including enhancements to the host dwelling and the wider streetscape. I acknowledge the local support for the redevelopment of the garage; however, this has not led me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Everitt

INSPECTOR