



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/20/3260530

65 Keppel Road, Dagenham, London, RM9 5LU

- 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 Abdul Aziz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 20/01145/HSE, dated 28 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor wrap-around extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area;
 - the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at 67 Keppel Road.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The development plan includes policies CP2 and CP3 in the Council's Core Strategy (2010) and BP2, BP8 and BP11 in its Borough Wide Development Plan Policies DPD (2011). It also includes policy D4 in the Published London Plan 2021 (LP) which is unchanged from the Intend to Publish version referred to in the Council's decision and has replaced the policies in the 2016 London Plan referred to in its decision. Together these seek to ensure that development delivers high-quality design that respects the local context and preserves or enhances non-designated heritage assets. They are consistent in this respect with national policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which has similar objectives.
4. The appeal site lies within the Becontree Estate, a non-designated heritage asset referred to in the Council's policies. The estate has historic significance having been built as Homes fit for Heroes in the interwar period and at the time was the largest municipal estate in the world. Whilst there have been some changes, its architectural significance lies in its cottage estate design which remains evident with symmetrical arrangements of semi-detached and terraced houses set behind front gardens and often privet hedges, resulting in a balanced and uniform street scene.

5. The appeal site comprises an end terraced house in a terrace of four houses. It lies at the end of a short, pedestrianised cul-de-sac in a tucked away, corner position. It has an existing single storey, flat roof extension to the side and rear elevations.
6. The proposed development would extend above that at first floor level on the side elevation, extending the ridge of the existing hipped roof on the front elevation and projecting beyond the existing first floor rear elevation with a lower hipped roof. It would also have a small single storey addition with a lean-to roof along the side elevation.
7. The end dwelling at the opposite end of the terrace has not been extended on its side elevation and the terrace retains its original symmetrical form. Despite its tucked away position, by reason of its scale and the lack of a set back from the front elevation, it would be clearly seen in the approach along the cul-de-sac. The proposed extension, by reason of its siting and scale, would therefore unbalance the symmetry and uniformity of the terrace.
8. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed development would fail to respect its local context and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. It would be contrary to the development plan policies referred to earlier.

Living conditions

9. Development plan policies CP3 in the CS, BP8 and BP11 in the DPD and D4 of the LP together seek to ensure that developments provide high quality design and layout or a good standard of residential amenity and are consistent in this respect with the Framework which has similar objectives.
10. 67 Keppel Road is sited at 90° to the appeal dwelling. The front elevation of the proposed extension would be sited in close proximity to the side elevation of no 67, separated by the side boundary. I noted at my visit that no 67 has a narrow window at first floor level and another window at ground floor level in that side elevation.
11. However, as the proposed extension would be set back from the rear elevation of no 67, it would not completely obscure the view from that property across the garden of the appeal site. The windows are sited in the rear half of the side elevation at no 67. As the only first floor window in the proposed extension would be in the front half of its side elevation, there would not be any direct overlooking and the privacy of no 67 would be maintained. As such, it would not be unduly harmful in terms of the outlook from those windows.
12. As the proposal would be sited to the east of those windows, they would also receive an adequate amount of daylight and sunlight as the sun would move around to the south of the proposed extension.
13. I conclude then that the proposal would not cause significant harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at no 67 and in this respect, it would accord with the development plan policies referred to in earlier in this section.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons stated above, notwithstanding my findings in regard to living conditions, I conclude that the harm I have found in terms of character and

appearance is significant and overriding. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that would outweigh this. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector