



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2021

**by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 04 October 2021.**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/21/3276230**

**21 Bennett Road, Chadwell Heath, Romford, RM6 6ES.**

- 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 Khurram Kayani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
  - The application Ref 21/00544/HSE, dated 24 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2021.
  - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 21 Bennett Road, Chadwell Heath, Romford, RM6 6ES in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00544/HSE, dated 24 March 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) 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.
  - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: D 01, 02, 03, 04,05,07,09,10,11, and 12.

### Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host property and the terrace of which it is part.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property, 21 Bennett Road, is an end of terrace two-storey house in a short terrace of three houses. The properties in the terrace have been the subject of design changes and minor additions over time. The street is characterised by a mix of housing types with a school opposite.
4. The appellant proposes a first floor side extension, built over an existing utilitarian flat roof single storey side projection. The proposed addition would be set back from the street façade of the dwelling with a pitched roof, the ridge

line of which would be set down below that of the main dwelling. While the first floor addition like the ground floor projection would be built up to the boundary of number 23 it would not encroach on the side access to the neighbouring property. Thereby maintaining a visual gap between the adjoining terraces. Although this is currently a wide gap at first floor level, as identified by the appellant, and as I observed on the occasion of my visit, narrow gaps between properties are not uncommon in this and neighbouring streets.

5. Overall, in my judgement, the proposed addition would appear as a subservient well-mannered addition to the host property.
6. In respect of the terrace I accept that the proposed first floor addition will alter its appearance when viewed from the street. However, the existing single storey extension along with the various alterations to neighbouring dwellings, has already changed the character and appearance of the property and the terrace of which it is part. Therefore, in my judgement, given the unattractive utilitarian appearance of the existing single projection the proposed first floor addition would, on balance, serve to better reflect the vernacular character and appearance of the terrace.
7. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that while the proposed extension would to some extent change the appearance of the host property and terrace it would not harm its architectural integrity or that of the terrace. It would therefore accord with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy D4 of the London Plan (Adopted March 2021), Policy CP3 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy (Adopted July 2010) – *Planning for the future of Barking and Dagenham*, Policies BP8 and BP11 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (Adopted March 2011) – *Planning for the future of Barking and Dagenham*, London Borough of Barking and Dagenham *Residential Extensions and Alterations* Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted February 2012) and Policies SP4, DMD1 and DMD6 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Draft Local Plan 2037 (Regulation 19 Consultation version (September 2020) as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of design and the protection of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

### **Conditions**

8. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building.
9. The Council have suggested that, in the interests of the character and amenity of the local area, permitted development rights falling within Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) shall be removed by condition. However, based on the lack of evidence in support of this suggestion I do not consider, in this case given the nature and detail of the proposal that there is clear justification for such a condition.
10. In the interests of certainty, I shall impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

## **Conclusions**

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Philip Willmer*

INSPECTOR