



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2021

by Cullum J A Parker BA(Hons) MA MRTPI MCMI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/21/3271953
563 Gale Street, Dagenham, RM9 4TS

- 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 Arter against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 20/02320/HSE, dated 18 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension at 563 Gale Street, Dagenham, RM9 4TS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/02320/HSE, dated 18 November 2020, 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: Existing and proposed plans and elevations – 20/10/2/1 Dated October 2020.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of an end of terrace two storey dwelling, located on a 'banjo' cul-de-sac. The appeal scheme seeks the erection of single storey side extension of an irregular shape to maximise land usage and follow the established site boundaries. For example, at various points the extension would have a width of roughly 1.45 to 5.6 metres depending on where this is measured. The height to the eaves would be around 2.6 metres with a maximum height on the half hip style roof being approximately 3.8 metres. There would also be rooflights within the roof form.

4. The Council's concerns revolve around three main areas – the rooflights, the height and relationship with a first-floor window, and the overall form of the proposal's roof.
5. With regard to the rooflights, these are a typical feature within many residential properties and would not look odd within this specific setting. Their use is limited and in locations (the roof of a single storey extension) where most people would anticipate on seeing them. It is unclear as to how such a feature in this case would result in any adverse impact on the character of the appeal building or the wider area.
6. In terms of the relationship with the first-floor window, the proposed roof is likely to cover the lower part of the window when viewed from the public realm. However this window is not a defining feature of the street scene or of any particular architectural interest. Moreover, such arrangements are not atypical within such contexts.
7. Lastly, the Council consider that the half hipped roof is discordant within the context of the appeal site, the appeal building, and the wider Becontree Estate. However, as the appellant points out, the appeal site is not located within a conservation area or other similar designated area. Moreover, the half hipped roof form sought is not unusual within residential areas and is an appropriate design solution in this case given the spacing restrictions within the appeal site owing to the unusual boundary layout.
8. I note concerns raised in respect of the lack of other openings serving the proposed kitchen space. However, how internal space is used is typically a matter for other regulatory regimes, and the Appellant and future occupiers would be fully aware of the potential limitations this might result in.
9. I therefore find that the proposed development would not result in an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with Policies CP2 and CP3 of the Core Strategy 2010, Policies BP2, BP5 and BP11 of the Borough Wide DPD 2011, as supported by the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD, and Policies HC1, D1 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 which amongst other aims seek to ensure that proposals protect or enhance the character and amenity of the area.

Conditions

10. Conditions requiring the proposal to be implemented with the submitted drawings and using matching materials are necessary to provide certainty and for the avoidance of doubt. Such conditions would accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and the guidance set out in the national Planning Practice Guidance and the use of planning conditions.

Conclusion

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

CJA Parker

INSPECTOR