Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2016

by B Bowker  Mplan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26 August 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/16/3149961
2 Kingsley Close, Dagenham, Barking and Dagenham RM10 7BQ

- 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 Warren Clingan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 16/00113/FUL, dated 15 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2016.
- The development proposed is described as ‘revised application (15/01373/FUL) for new 2 storey attached dwelling’.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located at the corner of Kingsley Close and Muggeridge Road. The proposed dwelling would be located in the side garden of No 2 Kingsley Close. Dwellings in the surrounding area are predominantly terraced and semi-detached, characterised by side gable ends and by being set back from the road with an established building line. These factors create a pleasant spacious appearance. The side elevation of No. 2 is set away from the corner and dwellings along Kingsley Close are set back a similar distance. Therefore, the site makes an important contribution to the spacious appearance of the surrounding area.

4. Whilst the proposal is intended to have a deliberative role in the street scene, its location to the side of No.2 would reduce the spacious appearance of the surrounding area. The resultant loss of spaciousness would be noticeable owing to the proposal’s location on a prominent corner plot. In particular, the loss of spaciousness would be seen from Kingsley Close and Muggeridge Road. The proposal’s front facing gable would be in stark contrast when viewed alongside the otherwise symmetrical appearance of the host semi-detached pair of dwellings and surrounding properties. This harm identified would not be prevented by obtaining external roof and wall materials to match surrounding properties.
5. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy and Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document. Insofar as they relate to this matter, these policies require development to be high quality in design and protect the local distinctiveness and character of the surrounding area.

Other matters

6. Although not advanced in support of the appeal, modest benefits would arise which includes the proposal’s contribution to housing supply and support to construction employment. In addition, as the Council’s reason for refusal relates solely to character and appearance, no other harm is anticipated as a result of the proposal. However, these factors and modest benefits are outweighed by the proposal’s harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above, and having taken all matters raised into account, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.
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