



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2020

By R.Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/20/3262016

27 Purland Close, Dagenham RM8 1AS

- 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 Sukumaran Thazhakkal against the decision of London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 20/01511/HSE, dated 24 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey outbuilding in garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey outbuilding in garden at 27 Purland Close, Dagenham RM8 1AS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01511/HSE, dated 24 July 2020, and the plans submitted with it, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL01; DR-03-001; DR-04-001; DR-03-002; DR-04-002; and DR-04-003.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the outbuilding hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing house.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development in the banner heading above from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form because it more accurately describes the proposal before me than the description provided in Part 4 of the planning application form.
3. The Council refer to several policies within the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 18 Consultation Version, November 2019). However, as the Draft Local Plan may be subject to further change, I only attach limited weight to these policies.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host house and the area, notably the Becontree Estate.

Reasons

5. No.27 Purland Close (No.27) is a semi-detached bungalow located within the Becontree Estate, built as Homes for Heroes between 1921 and 1934. Policy CP2 of the LDF Core Strategy (July 2010) (CS) recognises that the Estate is an important symbol of the past. Whilst I recognise this historical importance, Purland Close itself is characterised by modest semi-detached bungalows with gable projections to small front gardens. Between each semi-detached pair is access to a garage set well back from the road.
6. The proposal is to replace the existing garage to the rear of No.27 with a single storey outbuilding. I saw from my site visit that garages on Purland Close are typically of functional design with a flat roof and the design of the proposed outbuilding reflects this. As the proposed outbuilding would be set back from the road, on a similar front building line, it would not be any more prominent than the existing and would not therefore cause harm to the character or appearance of the area.
7. The proposed outbuilding would have a significant depth of around 10m extending almost the full length of the garden of No.27 along the common boundary with No.29 Purland Close (No.29). Despite this depth, the width of the outbuilding would be only 3m and as such would not be disproportionate to the overall size of the plot leaving a reasonably sized garden.
8. No.29 Purland Close (No.29) has a garage in the garden on the common boundary with No.27. The proposed outbuilding would extend beyond this, toward the rear boundary, by around 4.8m and would be around 0.5m higher than the neighbouring garage. Despite its siting and scale, given the location of No.29's garage, I am not persuaded that the proposal would result in significant enclosure to the rear part of the garden of No.29 or would appear unduly overbearing. It would therefore be consistent with the guidance in the *Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012)* which states that outbuildings should be designed and positioned to restrict impact on neighbours.
9. Although located very close to the rear boundary of the garden, adjoining playing fields, the rear elevation of the outbuilding would be largely screened by the existing metal and timber close boarded fence on this boundary. It would also be viewed in the context of other garages in the gardens of houses on the eastern side of Purland Close which, as I saw on site, vary in siting and size.
10. I have had regard to the Council's comments regarding the potential for the outbuilding to be used for purposes other than ancillary to the main dwellinghouse. However, this is not for me to determine and, in any event, there is no substantive evidence before me that this would be the case despite the inclusion of a bathroom on the submitted drawings.
11. In conclusion, the proposed outbuilding would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, or wider area including the Becontree Estate. I therefore find it would comply with Policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6

of the London Plan (2016), Policy D4 of the Publication London Plan (December 2020), Policy CP3 of the LDF Core Strategy (July 2010) (CS) and Policies BP8 and BP11 of the LDF Borough Wide Development Plan Policies DPD (March 2011) (DPD) which collectively require development to be of a high-quality design and to respect existing character. These policies are consistent with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in seeking high quality development. It would also comply with CS Policy CP2 and DPD Policy BP2 because it respects the local context and distinctiveness of the Becontree Estate.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard 3-year implementation condition, a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition requiring materials to match those of the existing house is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the host property and wider area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal is allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR