

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2019

by Ian Harrison BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/19/3235273

12 Eastfield Gardens, Dagenham RM10 8PX

- 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 Mrs M Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 18/01964/FUL, dated 14 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 29 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 2no. bedroom bungalow on land to side of no. 12 Eastfield gardens and a single storey rear extension to existing dwelling.
-

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 site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a residential area that is defined by a formal arrangement of 2 storey terraced dwellings that are of consistent scale and similar appearance, albeit many of the dwellings have been extended or altered. Eastfield Gardens comprises of a row of terraced dwellings to each side of the central road and footway, with a perpendicular terrace terminating the view along the road.
4. The appeal site is located at the end of the perpendicular terrace and contains a 2 storey dwelling with a hipped pitched roof that has been extended to the side with a single storey, lean-to style roofed extension. As the site is at the corner of the group of dwellings, the dwelling benefits from a large garden to the side and rear.
5. The proposed development would involve the erection of single storey side and rear extensions to enable the creation of a new dwelling and the extension of the existing dwelling. The extensions would result in hipped, pitched roofs being formed to the side of the existing dwelling and a flat roof extension to the rear. The presence of the neighbouring terrace and the recessed frontage of part of the proposed extension would enable the dwelling to be mostly hidden from the road. However, the side extension would still be visible from the pedestrian footway and from within the surrounding properties and would therefore have an effect on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

6. As set out above, the area is characterised by the consistent scale and form of the dwellings and their formal arrangement. The single storey dwelling would be at odds with the scale and appearance of all other dwellings within the vicinity of the site and the positioning of the dwelling would erode the formal arrangement of the built form.
7. Whereas the existing extension at the side of the dwelling appears as a subservient addition to the existing dwelling and has a discreet visual effect, the width of the proposed extension and the provision of an entrance would result in the extension appearing as a separate dwelling. The proposed dwelling would therefore have a significantly different appearance than the existing extension and the associated conflict with the formal arrangement of the buildings would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The materials and parts of the design would replicate other buildings in the locality and the size of the plot is sufficient to contain a dwelling with a garden that is consistent with other surrounding dwellings. However, these factors do not mitigate the visual harm that would arise as a result of the conflict with the pattern and layout of development within the locality. Overall, the proposal would fail to respect or be sympathetic to the established character of the locality.
9. The Council state that the site is part of the Becontree Estate which is specifically mentioned within policies CP2 of the Core Strategy 2010¹ (CS) and BP2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD 2011² (BWDP). I have been provided with no detail of the extent of the Becontree Estate and can therefore give this matter minimal weight. Nevertheless, the inclusion of the site within a non-designated heritage asset would not reduce the significance of the harm identified and therefore this does not alter my conclusion in respect of the main issue.
10. Overall, for the reasons set out above, the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area contrary to policy CP3 of the CS and policy BP11 of the BWDP which require that development protects and enhances the character of an area and achieves high quality in relation to the layout and design of new buildings.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian Harrison

INSPECTOR

¹ Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham – Core Strategy (July 2010)

² Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham – Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011)