
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2019

by D Peppitt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/19/3232799

44 Grafton Road, Dagenham RM8 3EP

- 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 Olu Ladipo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 19/00136/FUL, dated 24 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension above existing ground floor side extension.
-

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 host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a 2-storey end-of-terrace property on Grafton Road. The road is residential in nature and is characterised by 2 storey terrace properties with pebbledash and rendered cladding. The property sits on the crossroad junction with Valence Wood Road. Due to its location within one of the four corners of the junction, it is a prominent property within the street scene. There is an area of green space located between the property and No 164 Valence Wood Road. The area of green space is a key feature which is replicated in the other corners of the crossroad. Whilst I observed that not all 4 corners of the junction remain in their original form, there is still a sense of symmetry to the junction in terms of its openness, which is part of the special character of the area.
4. The site is located within The Becontree Estate, an area built as Homes for Heroes in the period 1921 to 1934. Whilst it is not a conservation area, Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy, adopted July 2010 (Core Strategy), references that it is an important part of the areas heritage, and it is recognised for its open characteristics which were built on the garden city principles.
5. The host property has an existing ground floor extension and seeks to build a first-floor extension over this. Whilst the green space to the side of the property would not be effected by the proposal, the openness between the host

property and the neighbouring property would be. Although there is a ground floor extension the properties are broken up by the boundary fence which separates them. The proposal would introduce built form at first-floor level, thereby bringing the appeal property and No 164 significantly closer, whilst closing the gap that currently exists between the properties at the first-floor level. This gap is currently readily visible from the junction with Valence Wood Road. Therefore, I consider that the proposal would fail to respect the open characteristics of the area.

6. I note that the appellant has highlighted the existence of other properties which have been extended to the side¹, which I was able to see on my site visit. However, their presence does not automatically mean this appeal should be allowed. Whilst I acknowledge that the permissions 04/00518/FUL and 10/00509/FUL relate to the area diagonally opposite the proposal, I have assessed the proposal before me on its own individual merits. The proposals diagonally opposite the site have sought to keep the gap between them more readily apparent than the proposal. This is helped by No 187 only having a single storey extension with a pitched roof in the area nearest No 55a Grafton Road. Further the gap between No 187 and No 55 was significantly larger than that between the proposal and No 164, thus, it was able to accommodate an additional dwelling within the street scene. Therefore, these examples do not outweigh the harm that I have found.
7. Consequently, I conclude the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Core Strategy Policy CP2, policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document, adopted March 2011 and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, adopted February 2012. These policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development is of high quality and respects and reflects the existing context and local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

8. I note that a neighbouring property has concerns about a loss of sunlight and daylight to their property, as well as loss of sunlight to their solar panels. The adjacent dwelling, No 164, has a first-floor side window which serves a landing area. Therefore, the proposal would not result in a reduction of light to a habitable room. With regards to the kitchen window, this room also overlooks the rear garden. Hence the window nearest the proposal would be a secondary source of light and not the main source of light. I therefore consider that the proposal would not significantly harm the living conditions of No 164 in respect of sunlight and daylight. In terms of the effect of the proposal on the solar panels, I have no substantive evidence before me to support this claim.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Peppitt

INSPECTOR

¹ Planning application references 04/00518/FUL, 10/00509/FUL, 18/00771/FUL and 18/00649/FUL