



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2022

by R J Redford MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/21/3279626

176 Lillechurch Road, Dagenham RM8 2BZ

- 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 Gramoz Kastrat against the decision of London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00907/HSE, dated 17 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council's decision referred to superseded London Plan policies despite the London Plan having been adopted in March 2021. Additionally, they have referred to the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Local Plan (Reg 19 consultation version, October 2020) (Draft LP), which is currently at examination. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was also revised in late July 2021. The Council have confirmed which policies are now in place and the appellant has had opportunity to comment on both the extant and emerging policies and the Framework. I will therefore reference the revised policies and Framework in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

4. Lillechurch Road links Bromhall Road to Cornworthy Road and is part of the Becontree Estate. While not part of a conservation area, this is a dense residential estate, with a consistent layout and architectural character. It was built as part of the 20th Century 'Home for Heroes' developments. The banjo layout is unique to the Becontree Estate. It generally provides a physical break in the repetitive cadence of the street scene, formed by lines of terraces with little space between them. This is no different for Lillechurch Road which has 3 banjos along its length, 2 with vehicular access at the beginning and 1 with pedestrian access only.
5. The host dwelling is located on Lillechurch Road adjacent to the vehicle access which forms part of one of the banjos. It is the end property of a two-storey,

short terrace and shares a forward-facing gable with the attached property. The third property in the terrace has a plain frontage, excepting a porch. This is echoed by the terrace on the opposite side of the banjo, and similar to the other banjo on Lillechurch Road with vehicular access. The side elevation of the host dwelling is in line with the front elevations of the properties behind it which are within the banjo. This also echoes the opposite side of the banjo as well as many of the other banjos within the estate.

6. The proposed development's width and two-storey height would create a large extension which could be considered human in scale, insofar as it has been designed for the specific needs of the appellant. The proposed front elevation would be parallel to the frontage of the host dwelling and the fenestration would match. This is consistent with the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) (SPD). If the proposal were viewed in isolation within the existing terrace, it would reflect the plainer fronted dwelling at the opposite end of the terrace, thereby making the gable a central feature. However, in this specific instance, the off-centre location of the gable has been designed to balance the terrace on the opposite side of the banjo, so drawing attention to the unusual road layout. The proposal would therefore harm this relationship and weaken the specific design of the host property in relation to the wider area. It would also extend significantly beyond the front elevation of the properties within the banjo behind. This would narrow the physical gap within the building line along Lillechurch Road and reduce openness and views out of the banjo, thus harming the character of the street scene.
7. The harm identified above would also have a detrimental impact on the historic character of the appeal site's surroundings. This is due to the negative impact on the form of the banjo as part of the Becontree Estate's layout.
8. On visiting the appeal site, I viewed examples of other similarly sized extensions within the area, including those submitted by the appellant. However, most of these properties were not located at the entrances of banjos. Two properties which were similarly located were 212 Lillechurch Road and 58 Bromhall Road. No 212's extension extends beyond the frontage of the properties on the banjo but is only single storey, and No 58 has a double storey extension but does not extend beyond the frontages on the banjo. In all cases, the circumstances are not similar to the proposed development and therefore do not outweigh the harm found.
9. The appellant's proposal to use energy efficient materials and construction methods is commendable, but without details of how this would be implemented I am unable to give it any weight. The appellant's need for additional living space is acknowledged, as is the retention of adequate outdoor space and the lack of impact on the living conditions of occupants of adjacent properties. However, these factors would not alter my findings.
10. The appellant has referred to various paragraphs from the Framework, including those relating to sustainable development and good design. I have had regard to these, but they do not mediate the harm identified.
11. To conclude, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. This would be contrary to policies D1, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021 (London Plan), policies CP2 and CP3 of the Local Development Framework: Core Strategy (July 2010) (Core

Strategy), policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Local Development Framework: Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011), paragraph 130 of the Framework, and the SPD, in so far as they relate to good design and having regards to local character and appearance. These principles are also reflected in the emerging policies SP 2, DMD 1, DMD 4 and DMD 6 of the Draft LP.

12. London Plan policy D8, Core Strategy Policy CR2, and Draft LP policies SP 4 and DMNE 3 have been referred to by the Council. I have however not referred to them above as they do not appear to be directly relevant to character and appearance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole along with all other relevant material considerations including the approach in the Framework, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

RJ Redford

INSPECTOR