



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/20/3258276

60 Arden Crescent, Dagenham, RM9 6TP

- 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 Michael Barrett against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 19/01336/FUL, dated 10 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2020.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'Fitting of 4 CCTV cameras recording property grounds. Two of the cameras on the front recording the drive, one of which records 24/7 and the other on Motion Detection mode. A single camera covering the side gate on Motion Detection mode. A single camera covering the garden and outbuilding at back of garden on Motion Detection mode. CCTV is to be recorded on a hard drive for evidence purposes. Connected to WiFi network internally to the house through TP-Link for remote access to all cameras in live mode. Wiring feeds to cameras not exposed externally to house and fed through loft cavity.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 'Fitting of 4 CCTV cameras recording property grounds. Two of the cameras on the front recording the drive, one of which records 24/7 and the other on Motion Detection mode. A single camera covering the side gate on Motion Detection mode. A single camera covering the garden and outbuilding at back of garden on Motion Detection mode. CCTV is to be recorded on a hard drive for evidence purposes. Connected to WiFi network internally to the house through TP-Link for remote access to all cameras in live mode. Wiring feeds to cameras not exposed externally to house and fed through loft cavity' at 60 Arden Crescent, Dagenham, RM9 6TP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01336/FUL, dated 10 August 2019.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit the CCTV cameras had been installed and the proposal is therefore retrospective.
3. The Council refer to several policies within the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 18 Consultation Version, November 2019). However, as the Draft Local Plan is at an early stage and may be subject to further change, I only attach limited weight to these policies.

Main Issue

4. The main issues in this case are:

- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area with particular reference to the perception of crime; and
- The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular reference to privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling which is located in a residential area comprising of mainly terraced properties. There is also a school opposite the appeal site. The appeal proposal concerns the installation of 4 CCTV cameras which have been positioning around the property for security purposes.
6. Of these, 2 CCTV cameras have been installed on the front elevation of the dwelling. The cameras are small in size and have been discretely positioned just beneath the eaves at both corners of the dwelling. The cameras provide surveillance of the appellant's driveway and a small section of the adjacent public highway. The cameras are not unduly prominent or obtrusive and due to their small size and siting, they are barely perceptible in the street scene. I am therefore satisfied that the cameras provide an appropriate balance between the need for security whilst not leading to a significant perception of crime. Moreover, I also noted at my site visit that several other dwellings in the immediate area have installed CCTV cameras.
7. Accordingly, the proposal complies with Policies CP3 of the LDF Core Strategy (2010) (CS) and Policies BP8 and BP11 of the LDF Borough Wide Development Plan Policies DPD (March 2011) (DPD) which among other things, seek to protect privacy and provide safe environments that reduce the fear of crime and improve crime prevention.

Living conditions

8. As described above, the two cameras on the front elevation of the dwelling provide surveillance of the appellants driveway and a small section of the adjacent public highway. I am satisfied that as a result of their small size and discrete positioning, they do not lead to a perception of overlooking of neighbouring occupiers.
9. Two further cameras have been installed on the dwelling. These are similarly small in size and the appellant confirms that they work on motion detection. One of these cameras is installed at a low level and provides surveillance along the side access to the home, whilst the other is shown to be centrally located on the rear elevation of the property with the purpose of providing security to the rear entrance. The cameras are sited such that they do not lead to the perception that neighbouring properties are being overlooked, even when considered in combination with the cameras on the front elevation of the dwelling.
10. In conclusion, the proposal does not have a materially harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings with particular

reference to privacy. The proposal complies with Policies CP3 of the CS and Policies BP8 and BP11 of the DPD which among other things, seek to protect privacy and provide safe environments that reduce the fear of crime and improve crime prevention. Furthermore, I am satisfied that the proposal would not conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework or Policies 7.1, 7.4, and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) insofar as they are relevant to this appeal. The Council also refer to Policy D4 of the Draft London Plan Intend to Publish (December 2019) which seeks to deliver good design and does not appear to be directly relevant to the appeal proposal.

Conditions

11. It is not necessary to impose any conditions as the development has already been carried out.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR