



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2020

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/19/3243860

77 Woodbridge Road, Barking IG11 9ES

- 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 Shabon Nasir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 19/01288/FUL, dated 30 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey infill extension at new build property at 77 Woodbridge Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey infill extension at new build property at 77 Woodbridge Road, Barking IG11 9ES in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01288/FUL, dated 30 July 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the new build dwelling.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: DPB/BD/P/001, DPB/BD/P/002, DPB/BD/P/003, DPB/BD/P/004, DPB/BD/P/005, DPB/BD/P/006, DPB/BD/P/007, DPB/BD/P/008 and DPB/BD/P/009.

Procedural Matter

2. The name of the appellant as set out in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. The appeal form gives the name of the appellant as being the applicant's agent, however the right to lodge an appeal only extends to the named applicant. In any event, it has been confirmed that the appeal is being pursued by the original applicant.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - Character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area; and
 - Living conditions of residents with regards to amenity space.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is a new-build dwelling located to the side of a short terrace of properties. Planning permission has previously been granted for a new dwelling on the site and this was under construction at the time of my site visit.
5. The proposal consists of erecting a ground floor extension to the rear of the new dwelling. Whilst the proposal would increase the footprint of built development within the site, the extension would be of a limited size and would not be viewed as an overdominant or obtrusive addition to the building. There would be sufficient space within the site and separation from the site boundary so that it would not appear as overly constrained within the plot. Moreover, due to the location of the extension and the arrangement of the site, the proposal would not be readily visible from the public realm or nearby properties.
6. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore not conflict with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011 (DPDPD) in respect of urban design and having regard to the character and appearance of the area.

Living Conditions

7. The proposal would reduce the size of the garden area available to the future residents of the dwelling. However, garden areas would be provided on three sides of the dwelling, and I saw that the garden to the rear and side would be of suitable size and privacy to meet the needs of future residents. I also note the appellants contention that the proposal would meet the Council's policy on external amenity space.
8. The proposal would also be set back from the amenity space of the adjoining dwelling and would be of a limited scale. It would therefore not have an adverse impact on neighbouring residents in respect of matters including outlook and overshadowing.
9. Based on what I have seen and read, I conclude that the proposal would provide amenity space of suitable size and functionality to meet the needs of future residents and would not harm the amenity space of nearby residents. The proposal would therefore not conflict with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the DPDPD in respect of protecting residential amenity.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all material planning considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. In addition to the standard 3 year time limitation for commencement, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. A condition requiring matching materials is appropriate in the interests of character and appearance.

David Cross INSPECTOR