



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

by Mark Philpott BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/21/3287450

155 St. Georges Road, Dagenham RM9 5JU

- 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 Benson Matesun against the decision of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01716/HSE, dated 14 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is part single part double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part single part double storey side extension at 155 St. Georges Road, Dagenham RM9 5JU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01716/HSE, dated 14 September 2021, 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: 21/084-01; 21/084-02; 21/084-03; 21/084-04; 21/084-05.
 - 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 dwellinghouse.

Procedural Matter

2. The decision notice and officer's report refer to the 2019 version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). This had been replaced by a 2021 version by the time the decision was made. However, the appellant has provided comments on the current version of the Framework with the grounds of appeal. Moreover, there are limited differences between the 2 versions of the Framework in respect of the specific issues in contention, and so it has not been necessary to seek further views from the parties regarding this matter.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of appeal site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The site features an end of terrace 2 storey dwelling with a pitched and hipped roof and an attached garage with a flat roof. It is in a prominent location

adjacent to a junction between St. Georges Road and Beverley Road. It is also adjacent to 99 Beverley Road which is an end of terrace property too. The terrace to which the appeal dwelling is part appears to have undergone extensions and alterations. In particular, the dwelling at the other end of the terrace features a front extension and a gable style side wall with a rear addition in part built up from it. The site is located within the Becontree Estate. Although the area is not designated as a conservation area, it is identified as having heritage significance in Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy (CS) and Policy BP2 of the Borough Wide Development Policies (DP).

5. The Council's concerns in respect of this proposal relate principally to the effects of the development infilling a gap at first floor level between the dwellings at Nos 155 and 99. It is put forward that gaps such as the one between the properties is a feature of significance in the area. Additionally, the guidance at paragraph 5.4.2 of the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out that where gaps between buildings contribute positively to the character of areas it is expected that the first floor of side extensions are set off side boundaries.
6. There are examples in the vicinity where gaps separate and provide a sense of openness between one dwelling and the next. This is particularly pronounced at the ends of terraces, on corner plots and near junctions. However, there are also examples where such gaps do not exist and continuous blocks of development face towards and turn corners instead, such as at the nearby terrace that includes 153 St. Georges Road and 92 and 94 Beverley Road. As such, there is some capacity for sensitive development in the gap. Moreover, the extension would be a small addition that would project from the side wall of the house to a limited extent and thus a gap between Nos 155 and 99 would still be evident from around the junction. The proposal would not harm the significance of the property or the surrounding area as a result.
7. The front wall of the extension would be parallel with the front elevation of the existing house in accordance with paragraph 5.4.2 of the SPD. Whilst the ridge of the extension would be set down from the ridge of the terrace, its hipped roof would nevertheless respect the roof design of the existing dwelling. Although the extension would not project the full depth of the house, this would not be readily apparent due to the siting of the extension and the position of No 99. The Council alleges that the proposal would compromise the terrace's symmetry; however, any symmetry that it may have originally had is no longer evident because of the changes to the terrace as identified above. The proposal would not be harmful in this regard.
8. I therefore find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the property or the surrounding area. Additionally, the heritage significance of the Becontree Estate would be preserved.
9. The proposal accords with CS Policies CP2 and CP3 and DP Policies BP2 and BP11 which, amongst other things, seek to protect the historic environment and the character of areas. It also accords with Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD6 of the Council's emerging Local Plan¹, which have similar objectives, and is in general accordance with the guidance on side extensions in the SPD. I also find no conflict with LP Policies D1, D4 and D8 which, alongside other matters, advise councils on the delivery of good design and set out criteria relating to

¹ London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Draft Local Plan 2037

the public realm. Additionally, the proposal accords with Chapters 12 and 16 of the Framework which, alongside other things, set out that development should be sympathetic to local character and that balanced judgements are required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss to non-designated heritage assets and the significance of those assets.

Other Matters and Conditions

10. The Council is concerned that the remaining part of the garage roof would be used as a terrace. However, the drawings show that only a window would face onto the flat roof. I have no compelling reasons to conclude that the development would lead to the use of the flat roof as a terrace and thus I find no issues with the proposal in respect of this matter.
11. A planning condition to require the surfaces of the development to match the existing materials would ensure that the proposal is compatible with the dwelling on site and the surrounding area. Additionally, the standard time and approved plans conditions are required in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

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

Mark Philpott

INSPECTOR