Appeal Decision
Site visit made on 24 April 2018
by Richard Aston  BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTP
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State
Decision date: 10th May 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/17/3188635
2 First Avenue, Dagenham RM10 9AT
- 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 Dr Fateh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/00207/FUL, dated 17 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2017.
- The development proposed is to remove existing garage and replace with a 2 storey extension to create a meeting and consulting room.

Decision
1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 2 storey extension to create a meeting and consulting room at 2 First Avenue, Dagenham RM10 9AT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00207/FUL, dated 17 February 2017, 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 following approved plans: 10460-1000A, 10460-1001, 10460-1002A, 10460-1003A and 10460-1004.

   3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matters
2. It was evident from my site visit that development had commenced and I have determined the appeal on this basis. In Part E of the appeal form, it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. There is nothing to suggest a change in description was agreed between the parties and I have therefore used the description given on the application form in the decision above, deleting the term ‘remove existing garage and replace with a’ as the garage has not been constructed and this is therefore superfluous.

https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate
Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is formed by a 2 storey doctor’s surgery fronting onto First Avenue, a 2 storey detached annexe to the rear and a single storey covered walkway linking the 2 buildings together. Sited on the corner of First Avenue and Crosby Road in a residential area, the site and its buildings are conspicuous within the streetscene. I also observed that a number of properties had been subject to significant alterations and extensions to the rear and side with large areas of rendered and painted flank walls abutting the pavement.

5. Although a large addition, the annexe building has already significantly altered the streetscene. The proposal would extend development further back but would be no higher than the existing eaves and ridge heights of the annexe. It would not extend across the whole width of the rear elevation and its form and materials would be sympathetic to the surgery building, the annexe and the prevailing built form within the area. Two windows in the side elevation and roof lights in the rear roof slope would also provide some limited visual relief, reflecting the appearance of fenestration of surrounding buildings. It would not be excessively deep and in such a context and even in combination with existing development, it would not appear so unduly dominant or overbearing to the extent that it would be visually incongruous.

6. For these reasons, the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property or area. It would accord with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011 (‘DPD’). Amongst other things and when taken as a whole, these require a high standard of inclusive design and that development protects the character and amenity of the area. The proposal would also provide for improved healthcare facilities and services in an established medical practice. This would also accord with Policy CC2 of the DPD, which supports proposals that retain or enhance existing community facilities.

Conditions

7. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council and a condition is required to ensure compliance with the approved plans as this provides clarity. A condition requiring details of the materials is necessary, in order to protect the character and appearance of the area and because this provides certainty.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, the proposal would accord with the development plan, when read as whole. Material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Richard Aston
INSPECTOR

1 LPA refs: 13/00382/FUL and 16/01505/FUL.