
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2020

by Rory MacLeod BA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/20/3244882
145 Stamford Road, Dagenham RM9 4ES

- 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 H Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 19/01452/FUL, dated 9 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of the existing garage and side extension and erection of a two storey 2-bedroom end of terrace house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development is taken from the decision notice as this more accurately captures the extent of development involved than that on the planning application form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are (a) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and (b) the adequacy of living conditions for future occupiers in relation to floor area and garden amenity space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal relates to an end of terrace house at the junction with Stamford Gardens referred to by the Council as a 'banjo cul-de-sac' of 16 houses to the rear of the site. The site forms part of the Becontree Estate, an extensive municipal estate of predominantly similar terraced houses.
5. The front and rear building lines would be continued to form the proposed house as would the hipped pitched roof; in these respects, the proposal would reflect local character. But it would be narrower than other houses in the terrace, whilst still extending close to the side boundary, and would reduce the openness at the neck of the banjo at the road junction. There is a similar development on the opposite side of this junction at 143 Stamford Road that constrains openness at the junction; but this relates to an extension to the house rather than a separate dwelling and received planning permission in 2001 prior to adoption of current planning policies. The house now proposed

would have a cumulative impact that would be harmful for the street scene when considered in combination with this existing extension. There is a distinctive character and rhythm to the terraces and spaces between them forming the Becontree Estate which would be undermined by the proposal.

6. The development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and in conflict with Policy CP2 of the Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy (2010) which recognises the Becontree Estate as an important symbol of the past and which seeks to reinforce local distinctiveness and historic context. There would also be conflict with Policies BP2 and BP11 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies (2011) (DPD) which recognise the heritage value of the Becontree Estate and encourage designs that protect and enhance local character.
7. The appellant has referred to several local examples of two storey side extensions to support the appeal, but their site circumstances differ from those at the appeal site. Some relate to domestic extensions rather than subdivision of a plot. The recessed extension at 125 Stamford Road on the corner with Flamstead Road appears to relate to a new dwelling, but this is alongside a wider more open road junction and has a larger garden resulting in a less cramped appearance.

Living conditions

8. The proposed house would have an open plan lounge and kitchen on the ground floor with two bedrooms and a bathroom above. Whilst the layout would produce regular shaped rooms, the overall floor area at 66.3 sqm, according to the appellant, would be below the minimum floor area of 70 sqm for a 2 bedroom, 3 person, 2 storey dwelling stipulated by Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016).
9. According to the Council's calculations, sub-division of the existing rear garden would result in a retained private amenity space of 67sqm for the 3-bedroom donor dwelling; this would be comparable to others in the terrace. But there would be only 30sqm for the 2-bedroom proposed dwelling, significantly below the minimum 50sqm for a 2-bedroom house set out in Policy BP5 of the DPD.
10. The proposal would result in a poor standard of accommodation for future occupiers in relation to the small size of both the internal floor area and garden amenity space. It would be contrary to adopted development plan policies.

Other matters

11. The proposal would result in the benefit of an additional dwelling that would make a small contribution to the general need for more housing in London. However, this benefit would be greatly outweighed by harm to the character and appearance of the area and for living conditions for future occupiers.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Rory MacLeod

INSPECTOR