Appeal Decision
Site visit made on 4 December 2018

by N Smith BA (hons) MA MRTPi
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/18/3210103
2 Review Road, Dagenham, RM10 9DH

- 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 Rash Gill against the decision of London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council.
- The application Ref 18/00694/FUL, dated 25th April 2018, was refused by notice dated 21st June 2018.
- The development proposed is to build 2 storey two-bedroom house.

Decision
1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue
2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons
3. The proposal would fill much of the garden space between the existing house and its side boundary. That space currently fulfils an important role in the street scene by providing a break in built form and setting it away from the pavement. Replacing the garden space with a two-storey dwelling would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area through the loss of a feature that currently makes a positive contribution to it. The Council’s Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document seeks to avoid such harm that it says can result from developing side gardens where they help to reduce a sense of enclosure, as is the case here.

4. The site is highly visible, and the development would be prominent, which would be especially problematic in this case because of the two-storey scale of the proposed house and its proximity to the site boundary and the footway beyond it. The blank wall facing the road would appear bulky and dominant and the angled design on the house would appear incongruous in its context.

5. For the reasons I have described, I find that the development would be in conflict with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document which, amongst other requirements, seek to ensure that development is of a high quality and is compatible with the character of the area within which it is located.
6. I note that the appellant considers that the side garden at the site is in a poor state of upkeep and that the development would enhance its neighbourliness and appearance, but that could be achieved without the development taking place. I viewed the development referenced by the appellant at 156 School Road on my site visit. Whilst I do not have full details of that case before me, it has had no impact on the character of the area around this site given its distance from it. The development would make a contribution towards meeting housing need but that contribution would be modest and whilst I note that the proposal could be energy efficient, built to Lifetime Homes standards and could be of a high quality for future occupiers, meeting the Housing Technical Standards in terms of internal space, these factors do not outweigh the policy conflicts that I have identified.

**Conclusion**

7. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

N Smith

INSPECTOR