Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2017

by Richard Schofield BA(Hons) MA MRTP

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

Decision date: 1st November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3182914

80 Gainsborough Road, Dagenham RM8 2DP

- 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 Rafal Bednarz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/00926/FUL, dated 5 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2017.
- The development proposed is described as, “erection of a two storey side and rear extension to provide a larger dining room/kitchen and dedicated utility room on ground floor and one additional bedroom with WC on the first floor. The proposed materials would match these [sic] of the existing main house. New windows will be in keeping regarding proportions and materials with existing.”

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Gainsborough Road is part of a mature residential suburb, characterised by terraced and semi-detached houses. There is a strong sense of place, with streets laid out in a clear plan form; dwellings of a coherent scale and form; the use of common building materials and building lines; and the location of feature buildings on corner plots. Side extensions do not appear to be a typical feature of the area, with semi-detached dwellings (variations in fenestration and use of render notwithstanding) typically retaining a strong sense of symmetry.

4. 80 Gainsborough Road (No 80) is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, with 13 Mayesbrook Road (No 13), which wraps around one of the four corners of the crossroads between Gainsborough Road and Mayesbrook Road. Identically styled pairs of dwellings are located on the other three corners, set back from the road behind triangular front gardens. Overall, this gives the crossroads a very distinctive and appealing formality, and uniformity, of design.

5. The appeal proposal would extend No 80 further down Gainsborough Road, unbalancing its characteristic symmetry with No 13. The largely blank
extension would appear as a rather stark and incongruous addition to the distinctive, compact design of the semi-detached pair.

6. In addition, the proposal would extend some way into the rear garden of No 80, out beyond the rear building line. It would be clearly visible from the rear elevation and rear garden of No 13, appearing as an uncharacteristically dominant and intrusive feature, at odds with the much more low key, single storey extensions to the rear of other surrounding dwellings.

7. The appeal proposal may not be visible from all points of the crossroads, but it would still be prominent in views from various public and private vantage points.

8. Reference is made to an extension to No 13. All that was apparent from my site visit was an extremely small, single storey side extension to the dwelling, set back from the front elevation. Its impact upon the symmetry of the pair is negligible. It certainly cannot be regarded as setting any kind of precedent for the appeal proposal.

9. Vicars Walk is a later 20th century infill development on Gainsborough Road, which jars with the prevailing design of the area. It is located next to No 80 and has interrupted the rhythm of development at this point, leaving a larger than typical gap between it and No 80. Nonetheless, I do not consider that this justifies further harm to the street scene at this point. Indeed, the space between No 80 and Vicars Walk arguably helps to draw a clear distinction between the two buildings, enhancing the prominence of No 80 as a feature.

10. I conclude that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with polices BP8 and BP11 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document. These seek to ensure, among other things, that new development protects or enhances the character of the area, creating a sense of local identity and distinctiveness.

**Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal proposal conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole. I do not consider there to be any material considerations that would outweigh this conflict and, thus, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.
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