

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2016

**by Alex Hutson MATP CMLI MArborA**

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

**Decision date: 21 October 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/16/3153597**

**Land to the rear of 24 Goring Road, Dagenham, Essex RM10 8BL**

- 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 Jamie Addis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
  - The application Ref 15/01452/FUL, dated 16 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 31 December 2015.
  - The development proposed is "Bungalow 2 bedroom detached".
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary matter

2. I note that the details of the appellant on the appeal form relate to the appellant's agent. Nevertheless, it is clear from the evidence that the appellant is Mr Jamie Addis and this is reflected in the banner heading above.
3. The Council, within Part 3 of their questionnaire, has indicated that the proposal would affect an ancient monument. However, the Council has confirmed that this is an administrative error and I have considered the appeal on this basis.
4. The appellant indicates, in Section H of the appeal form, an intention to submit a planning obligation. Nevertheless, no form of planning obligation has been forthcoming and it is unclear from the evidence what the purpose of one would be. Moreover, the Council has not indicated a specific requirement for a planning obligation. The lack of any planning obligation therefore has very little bearing on my consideration of the appeal and I have dealt with it on this basis.

### Main issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

6. The appeal site, which currently contains a static caravan, is located within a wider residential area and comprises the former large rear garden of 24 Goring Road. No 24 is a detached bungalow set back from and facing the road.
-

Whilst dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal site display a variety of architectural styles and sizes, the linear pattern of residential dwellings along the southern side of this part of Goring Road is a strong and defining characteristic of the streetscape and area. In addition, the typically large rear gardens of dwellings along the southern side of the road add a spatial quality to the area. These factors positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area.

7. The proposal seeks to erect a new, two bedroom bungalow on the appeal site. Whilst the design of the proposed bungalow would be architecturally sympathetic to other dwellings in the area, it would introduce a form of development considerably out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of residential development along this side of the road, given its back land location. This is notwithstanding that some boundary treatment has already been erected. Moreover, I observed that the proposed bungalow would be clearly apparent in views from along Goring Road, through the gaps between No 24 and the dwellings either side and from the windows and gardens of a number of nearby dwellings.
8. The proposed bungalow would therefore introduce an incongruous and uncharacteristic form of back land development that would considerably reduce the spatial qualities of the appeal site and area. Consequently, it would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. I do not consider that this intrinsic harm could be sufficiently mitigated through additional landscaping around the boundaries of the appeal site.
9. I acknowledge that some built structures exist in other rear gardens along the southern side of Goring Road. Nevertheless, these tend to be modest sized structures, clearly ancillary and subordinate to their host dwellings and do not share the features typical of separate dwellings. Moreover, whilst a static caravan has existed on the appeal site for over a year, the planning history of the appeal site indicates that permission for this structure was refused under Ref 15/00956/FUL. As such, and without any substantive evidence to demonstrate otherwise, it is therefore likely to be unlawful. I do not therefore consider that the presence of any existing rear garden structures in the area or the presence of the static caravan on the appeal site justifies a planning permission for a separate dwelling in this instance.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed dwelling would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to Policies BP8- Protecting Residential Amenity, BP11- Urban Design and CP3- High Quality Built Environment, of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011. These policies require, amongst other things, development to respect, protect, enhance and strengthen the local character of the area. These policies are consistent with the broad aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework that seek planning to take account of the different roles and character of different areas.

#### *Other matters*

11. I acknowledge that the Council has not raised any concerns in respect of neighbour living conditions. I also acknowledge that the proposed dwelling would be built to a high standard of energy efficiency, would be located within an area with a good level of access to local services and facilities and would

make a contribution, albeit a limited contribution, to housing supply within the Borough. In addition, I have taken into consideration the fact that the appellant is local to the area and indicates a desire to live in a home in close geographical proximity to his family. However, these matters are not, individually or cumulatively, sufficient to outweigh the harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Alex Hutson*

INSPECTOR