



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2019

by J Williamson BSc (Hons), MPlan, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/19/3226864
714-720 Green Lane, Dagenham, RM8 1YX

- 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 KC Estates Ltd against the decision of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 18/01759/FUL, dated 02 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 28 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is change of use of ground floor from D1 (training centre) use to A1 (retail)/A3 (restaurant/café) use; conversion of the upper floors from D1 use to C3 (dwellings) use to provide 6 two bedroom flats; including first and second floor rear extensions, installation of front rooflights, provision of a new residential entrance from Green Lane and associated car and cycle parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. It is noted that since the determination of application 18/01759/FUL the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been revised (February 2019). However, none of the changes are material to this case

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. I note that both parties have referred to a dismissed appeal related to the site (APP/Z5060/W/18/3195221). I acknowledge that the current proposal has sought to address the issues identified by the Inspector in that appeal.
5. The appeal site comprises the central section of a terraced building located within a secondary shopping frontage in the Green Lane district centre. The Council's sole concern relates to the proposed extensions to the rear of the premises, which would facilitate the creation of 6 two-bedroom flats on the first and second floors.
6. Although the rear elevation of the existing building has been altered over time with the addition of extensions and new fenestration, I concur with the view of the previous Inspector that the back roof retains a lot of its original character.

The rear red-tiled roof slope is substantially deeper than the front; flat-roofed dormer windows are incorporated within it to serve the second-floor rooms. A striking feature is the 3 tall chimneys within the roof slope. The dormers and chimneys are arranged in a symmetrical manner, giving a regular visual rhythm to the rear elevation.

7. The proposal would result in the removal of the 4 existing dormers and a sizeable Mansard-style flat-roof extension would be inserted, projecting off the rear elevation from approximately halfway up the roof slope (a little above the height of the existing dormers) and extending out to the depth of the existing building footprint. The extension would have a set-back either side of its central section.
8. Four dormer windows, very similar to the existing dormer windows, would be inserted in the central section of the extension on its rear roof slope at second-floor level. A window would be inserted in each of the roof slopes on the set-back sections. The proposed roof slope would be pitched, though the pitch is much steeper than that of the existing roof. Other glazed window and door openings would be inserted on the ground and first-floor rear elevations.
9. I note that the 3 large chimneys would be retained. Additionally, I acknowledge that the dormers proposed would be similar in size and design to the existing dormers and they would also be positioned at the same height, therefore lining up with the rest of the dormers in the terrace roof.
10. However, I consider that the substantial depth of the flat-roof extension would separate the proposed dormers from the other dormers on the terrace's rear roof slope, to an extent that would disrupt the existing rhythm. The windows inserted in the roof slopes of the set-back sections of the extension would appear as a conspicuous addition within the context of the dormers, both existing and proposed. Although a third floor has been removed from the previous scheme and the roof has a pitch, I conclude in a similar manner to the previous Inspector that the size and scale of the extension would still appear excessively bulky and the mass would dominate the rear elevation of the terrace.
11. Consequently, I consider that the proposed development would not relate well to the host building and as a result would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policy BP8 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) and DPD Policy BP11, which, amongst other things, jointly require new development to have regard to, and protect or enhance, the character of the area. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to achieve well designed places.

Other Matters

12. I note that no concerns have been raised regarding the change of use, neighbour amenities, outdoor space or highway matters and I concur with the Council's conclusions regarding these matters. Thus, the proposed uses would be acceptable within the district shopping centre. The amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties would not be significantly harmed. As the proposal is a conversion scheme there is no scope to provide on-site outdoor space, however, the site is located very close to a Goodmayes Park. A suitable

vehicle access and manoeuvring area would be provided along with adequate on-site car and cycle parking facilities.

13. The appellant has outlined a list of benefits that would derive from the proposal, ie contribution to the housing supply of the area, bringing an empty property back into use, provision of a mixed use development, provision of an appropriate town centre use at ground-floor level and enhancement to the district centre's vitality and viability, all of which could contribute to the regeneration of the area, as stated in a letter submitted by a property consultants in support of the proposal. However, although I attach significant weight to the social and economic benefits of the proposal as identified, these other considerations do not singularly or collectively outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons outlined above the appeal is dismissed.

J Williamson
INSPECTOR