



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/20/3260144

65 Chaplin Road, Dagenham, London, RM9 6EP

- 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 Irsidi Martinaj against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 20/01459/HSE, dated 15 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.
3. The development plan includes policies CP2 and CP3 in the Council's Core Strategy (2010), BP2, BP8 and BP11 in its Borough Wide Development Plan Policies DPD (2011). It also includes policy D4 in the Published London Plan 2021 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.
4. The appeal site lies within the Becontree Estate, a non-designated heritage asset referred to in the Council's policies and designated as an Area of Townscape Value. The estate has historic significance having been built as 'Homes fit for Heroes' in the interwar period and at the time was the largest public housing 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. Corner plots are generally wide and open, often set behind or adjacent to grassed verges and contribute positively to the character of the estate and the attractive openness of junctions.
5. The appeal site comprises an end terrace dwelling sited in a prominent corner position adjacent to a grassed verge at a four-way junction. It has had a hip to gable roof extension with a large flat roof dormer on the rear elevation which the Council says does not form part of this application or any other in its

records. It also has a small lean-to side extension with a front gabled porch canopy and an older, flat roof detached garage built of pebble dash rendered panels.

6. The proposed side extension would replace the existing garage, side extension and porch canopy, occupying the remaining width of the frontage up to the side boundary. Towards the rear, it would taper and would be set in slightly from the side boundary.
7. It would sit partly on the footprint of the existing garage and side extension and would not be significantly higher than those. As such it would not cause significant harm to the openness of the corner. However, it would have a greater footprint because it would fill in the gap which currently exists between those and would extend further towards the rear, therefore occupying a greater area. As its width would be more than half that of the existing house, it would not be a subordinate addition. Its size and scale would be disproportionate to the existing house and it would visually unbalance the dwelling and the terrace.
8. It would have a 'dummy pitch' hipped roof with a very shallow pitch which would be at odds with both the main pitched roof of the dwelling and with the steeper pitch of the hipped roofs which characterise most of the surrounding properties. This would be visually jarring and it would emphasise the overly large size and scale of the extension, which would be clearly seen from surrounding area given its prominent location. I am unable to consider any alternative roof design in this appeal as suggested by the appellant because that would prejudice the interests of the Council and any local residents who have not had the opportunity to comment on that.
9. The proposed materials would match those of the existing house. Whilst this would benefit the appearance of the property and the area, the unsympathetic size, scale and design would outweigh this.

Conclusion

10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension, by reason of its siting, size, scale and design would significantly harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area, contrary to the development plan policies referred to above. There are no material considerations that would outweigh this. The appeal is dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector