Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2016

by David Cross  BA (Hons), PGDip, MRPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 5 August 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/16/3147054
14 Rosedale Road, Dagenham, Essex RM9 4DU

- 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 Ardiane Lezi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 15/01680/FUL, dated 24 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2016.
- The development proposed is construction of new one bedroom end of terrace house on land adjacent to 14, Rosedale Road, Dagenham, Essex RM9 4DU.

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 area.

Reasons

3. The proposal consists of erecting an extension to the side of the property to create a separate dwelling. The site is adjacent to the junction between Rosedale Road and Burnham Road and the existing spacious garden creates an open character at this junction. The side elevation of the host property is also in line with the well-defined building line of Burnham Road, enabling unencumbered long distance views along this residential street.

4. The proposal would extend the massing of the existing 2-storey dwelling onto the side garden and would therefore project beyond the building line of Burnham Road. Although the appellant states that the house is only 4.7m wide, it would be located in close proximity to the back of the footway on Burnham Road and would be visually prominent in views of the site. The footprint of the proposal would also reduce the garden space around the existing dwelling, to the detriment of the open appearance of the area. Due to the scale and siting of the proposal it would therefore appear as an obtrusive feature projecting into views along Burnham Road, creating a sense of enclosure and reducing the open character of the area around the junction.

5. The appellant has referred to other examples of extensions that have been constructed in the area, which I viewed on my site visit. I am not aware of the precise circumstances of those examples or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration so I cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel
to the appeal proposal. However, the extensions at the junction between Burnham Road and Stamford Road were indicative of the detrimental effects that such extensions can have on the open character of the area. I also noted that the circumstances of the extension granted on appeal at 172 Canonsleigh Road were materially different as it did not project beyond the building line in long distance views and the context was established by a similar extension on the opposite property of 174 Canonsleigh Road. In any case I have determined the appeal on its own merits.

6. I acknowledge that the appeal site has a spacious garden to the side which could accommodate the development, and that the design of the extension would complement the host dwelling. I am also mindful of the appellant’s statement that the house would comply with the Lifetime Homes regime and that the space standards are based on those in the London Plan and meet the Council’s requirements. Furthermore, the proposal would provide a much-needed family home and increase the local supply of housing. But these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified previously.

7. Due to the scale, siting and location of the proposal I conclude that it would appear as an unduly prominent intrusion into the street scene and would detract from the open character of this area and that it would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy BP8 of the Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011 (DPDPD) which states that development should have regard to the local character of the area. The proposal would also conflict with Policy BP11 of the DPDPD which states that development should protect the character and amenity of the area. These policies are broadly consistent with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks positive improvement in the quality of the built environment.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross
Inspector

---

1 Planning for the future of Barking and Dagenham, Borough Wide Development Plan Policies, Development Plan Document (March 2011)