



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 11 October 2021

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/21/3270361

794 Rainham Road South, Dagenham, RM10 8YU

- 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 Onderski against the decision of London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01777/FUL, dated 19 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of bungalow and erection of 3 x 3 bedroom houses.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The most recent revision of the London Plan was published in March 2021, and the Government released a revised National Planning Policy Framework in July 2021. The main parties were invited to comment on the revised documents.
3. The Council has referred to policies in its draft Local Plan. From the evidence before me, this has not been submitted for public examination. Its policies therefore carry very limited weight in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area,
 - The effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers; and,
 - The availability of on-street parking in the vicinity of the appeal site.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The existing bungalow on the appeal site, together with the neighbouring bungalows at Nos 796 and 796A, form a modest feature in the Rainham Road South street scene, turning the corner into Dagmar Road. The proposed terrace of three houses would be a much larger building on the site, occupying almost its full width where the existing bungalow is set well off the boundary with No 792, albeit with a single garage in the space between the two houses.

6. By virtue of its greater height and width, the proposed terrace would be a much more prominent feature of the street scene. While neighbouring properties are terraced, there is consistency in their height and detailing, albeit that alterations and extensions have resulted in some blurring of this. The proposed terrace would have a half-hipped roof that would not be consistent either with the hipped roofs of the end terrace houses along Rainham Road South or the gabled roofs to Nos 796 and 796A. The eaves and ridge lines of the terrace would also be below those of the terraced houses along Rainham Road South, and the houses would be narrower than those on neighbouring plots which would provide the primary context in which the proposed terrace would be seen.
7. The terrace would be finished in matching materials to the development on the opposite side of the street. The provision of ground floor front projections would be modest features with limited visual impact in the street scene. The terrace would otherwise align with the established building line on this section of Rainham Road South.
8. Nonetheless, the height, width and detailed appearance of the terrace would result in it appearing cramped and out of keeping within the street scene overall. While there is a four-storey block opposite the site, together with a row of narrow terraced houses further along, these are not on the same side of the street and do not bear the same relation to the appeal site as the properties to either side of it.
9. The appeal proposal would therefore result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies D4 of the London Plan (the LP), CP3 of the Core Strategy and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Plan Policies Document (the DPPD). Collectively these policies require that new development achieve high quality standards in relation to the design and layout of new buildings and that it protect or enhance the character and amenity of the area.

Living conditions

10. The terrace would replace a hipped roof bungalow and flat-roofed garage. Because of its greater height and proximity to the boundary it would be a more prominent and overbearing feature when seen from No 796, especially from within the garden to that property. In addition, due to its height and siting closer to the street the terrace would be likely to cause a loss of daylight to the garden to 796 and the windows facing into this garden.
11. The rear windows to No 796 currently face onto the shared boundary between the properties and the extension to No 794. The outlook from these windows would not be unacceptably affected by the development, as the terrace would generally be a peripheral feature when seen from them.
12. Three households would occupy the site, rather than the one currently existing. Each house would have three bedrooms so would potentially be occupied by multiple individuals and would have smaller gardens than the existing single dwelling and most of the surrounding properties. This greater density of occupation would be likely to result in more noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers.

13. The proposed terrace would extend further along the shared boundary with No 792 than the existing garage currently does. However, this would principally be because of the single-storey rear projection. This relationship would not unduly harm outlook from No 792 as the projection would not be so deep that it would unreasonably curtail outlook from the rear of No 792. From within the garden of No 792 the terrace would be seen within the context of the neighbouring terraced houses and the four-storey block and terraced houses on the opposite side of the road. Any overshadowing or loss of daylight from the proposed development would principally be experienced in the early morning and would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 792.
14. Overall, the appeal proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. It would therefore conflict with Policies D14, GG1 and GG3 of the LP and BP8 of the DPPD. Collectively these policies require that development not lead to loss of immediate outlook, daylight and sunlight and avoid significant adverse noise impacts on health and quality of life.

Parking

15. The appeal proposal would provide one off-street parking space per house, in line with the Council's parking standards. This would result in the loss of two designated on-street parking spaces within the controlled parking zone that operates in the area. The appellant has suggested that, as these spaces are close to the junction with Dagmar Road, they compromise ingress and egress from the junction. However, I have no evidence to suggest that the junction is unsafe, and the spaces are not so close to the junction that their use appears likely to limit the flow of traffic or restrict the visibility of vehicles using the junction.
16. The development would therefore result in the loss of two designated on-street parking spaces in the area, contrary to Policy BR9 of the DPPD. Amongst other considerations Policy BR9 states that parking provision for each development will be agreed having taken into consideration on-street parking availability.

Planning Balance

17. The development would result in the creation of two additional dwellings overall, supporting the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. The LP also supports the provision of new housing within the city and recognises the importance of small sites in meeting housing targets. The houses would conform to Lifetime Homes standards, with floor and room areas conforming to the standards set out in the LP and local policies. The site is in a sustainable location with access to public transport as well as shops and services within walking distance. These factors weigh in favour of the appeal proposal.
18. Set against the benefits of the proposal, the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. It would also cause the loss of on-street parking in the area.
19. The harm arising from the appeal proposal would, in this instance, outweigh the benefits that it would deliver. There are therefore no material

considerations to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons set out above, the appeal fails.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR