Appeal Decision
Site visit made on 5 December 2017
by David Spencer BA(Hons) DipTP MRTP
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government
Decision date: 8th December 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3188716
12 Fordyke Road, Dagenham RM8 1PJ
- 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 Ms Y Trofimova against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/01094/FUL, dated 29 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2017.
- The development proposed is two storey side and single storey rear extensions.

Decision
1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue
2. The main issue is the effect of the two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons
3. The layout of housing on Fordyke Road comprises two storey terraced blocks, of generally 6 houses, with each block separated by a modest intervening gap. This pattern is consistent on both sides of Fordyke Road and the majority of gaps remain unaltered. Notwithstanding the variety in appearance to the dwellings the modest gaps provide for a characteristic rhythm of development and avoid the street scene become a continuous terrace of development. The gaps afford a moderate but important sense of openness to back gardens beyond given the relatively tight arrangement of housing close to the highway.

4. No.12 Fordyke Road is the end property of one the terraced blocks. The appeal proposal would infill the gap to the boundary with No.14 Fordyke Road with a two storey form of development that would replicate the scale and massing of the host dwelling. Whilst No.12 has an existing single storey extension within this side space leaving a narrow gap for a side gate, the modest scale and set back position of this extension means that the characteristic pattern of development within Fordyke Road and the important sense of openness from the gap are maintained. This is also the case with regards to the flat roof ground floor side extension at neighbouring No.14. In contrast, and despite being slightly set back, the scale and position of the proposed two storey side extension with its proposed uninterrupted pitched roof would harmfully erode the openness of the characteristic gap and would conspicuously result in a continuous terracing effect to the detriment of the wider street scene.
5. I observed the few examples of two storey side extensions in Fordyke Road referred to by the appellant. I have very little information before me on their planning history and in any event the enclosing appearance of these developments does not persuade me that they should set the pattern for development on Fordyke Road.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Barking & Dagenham Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011 which require development proposals, amongst other things, to protect or enhance local character and create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place through their layout and design. It therefore follows that the proposal would also fail to accord with the objective of the National Planning Policy Framework to secure high quality design.

7. The Council’s decision notice refers to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2012. In general terms I am not persuaded the appeal proposal would infringe the general design advice in this document at paragraph 5.4.2(a). However, I find that the particular circumstances at the appeal location mean that even a modestly set-back two storey extension within the remaining gap would be harmful for the reasons set out above.

8. The appellant submits that the appeal proposal would also provide an improved standard of accommodation for her family. That may well be the case but this benefit would not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Accordingly, and having considered all other matters before me, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Spencer
Inspector.