



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2022

by Peter White BA(Hons) MA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/21/3281460

31 Western Avenue, Dagenham RM10 8UD

- 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 L Gaxha against the decision of London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00680/HSE, dated 13 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the change of roof from flat roof to pitched roof for the rear outhouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change of roof from flat roof to pitched roof for the rear outhouse at 31 Western Avenue, Dagenham RM10 8UD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00680/HSE, dated 13 April 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: Location plan title no. EGL246754 and GLA-02L.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace and the area.

Reasons

3. 31 Western Avenue is a terraced dwelling with a long narrow garden. At the rear of the garden the existing garage building subject to this appeal is accessed via a gated track available only to residents. Beyond the site and track to the rear, trees within the Beam Valley Country Park mean there is only very limited visibility of the building from public areas.
4. The existing building is a detached flat roofed garage which the Council confirm was erected with planning permission. It is located a significant distance from the dwelling, beyond a lawn, at the far end of the garden.

5. The proposed pitched roof would have a central ridge with a shallow roof slope, and no increase in the height of the eaves on either side. The ridge would increase the building's prominence marginally as seen from the rear of dwellings on Western Avenue, but the proposed increase in height across a building of this width would be a modest change and would have a limited impact on the perceived mass and bulk of the building.
6. As a consequence, and considering its very limited visibility from public areas, it would not harm the character of the area, and given the significant separation between the existing building and the house, neither would the proposed development have a negative impact on the appearance of the house or on the built form of the terrace.
7. I conclude that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace or the area. It would therefore accord with the relevant provisions of The London Plan (2021) Policy D4, London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy (2010) Policy CP3, London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011) Policies BP8 and BP11, which seek design which has regard to local character. It would also accord with chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Garages section of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012), and London Borough of Barking and Dagenham draft Local Plan Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD6 which promote high-quality design.

Conditions

8. I have imposed the standard time limit for implementation, the approved plans for certainty, and a materials condition to ensure external materials respect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

Peter White

INSPECTOR