



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2022

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/22/3297799

176 Lillechurch Road, Barking & Dagenham, 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 Kastrati against the decision of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00345/HSE dated 1 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is construction of a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character of the host terrace and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey end-of-terrace property with a garden that wraps around the front, side and rear of the property to create a good sized plot. The appeal site is located within the Beacontree Estate and is located on a corner plot on the western side of the entrance to a banjo off Lillechurch Road. The Beacontree Estate, of which the appeal site forms part, is noted by the Council as being built as part of Homes for Heroes in the period 1921 to 1934 and at the time was the largest municipal estate in the world.
4. At the time of my site visit I found that the two corner plots at the entrance of the banjo are symmetrically aligned when viewed from the main road looking into the banjo. The banjo layout is a notable feature for the area designed to provide a physical break in the uniform, dense, development pattern that is formed by lines of terraces with limited space between them. Notably, the gaps either side of the corner plots also allow an open view from the properties within the banjo itself. The flank elevations on both end dwellinghouses currently align with those within the banjo when looking in, stood on the main Lillechurch Road.
5. At the time of my site visit I noted that Lillechurch Road has three banjos along its length. The proposed two storey side extension would project significantly beyond the front elevation of the properties within the banjo behind (number 174) as well as interrupt the current symmetry between the appeal site and 142 Lillechurch Road. I find that this would narrow the physical gap within the building line along Lillechurch Road and reduce openness and views out of the

banjo which would result in harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. This harm would also have a detrimental impact on the historic character of the surrounding area with the banjo being one of the intrinsic qualities of the area. The proposal would result in overall negative impact on the form of the banjo as part of the Becontree Estate's layout.

6. The proposal does appear to have been designed to try to be subservient to the original dwellinghouse when considered in isolation and reflects the host dwelling's character with regard to the roofscape as result of the hipped roof form. Despite this I find that the width of the extension, at 4.5m, would unbalance the row of dwellings which the appeal site is part of and it would still be of substantial scale. The proposal would therefore be harmful to the character of the terraced row which the appeal site forms part of. This is then combined with the impact I have identified to the character of the wider area with regard to the banjo as part of the Becontree Estate's layout. This could not be overcome with the imposition of conditions of any nature.
7. The proposal would be contrary to London Plan 2021 Policy D1 and Policy D4, Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2010 Policy CP2 and Policy CP3, Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011 Policy BP8 and Policy BP11 as far as they relate to, and seek to ensure, good design that has had regard for local character and appearance.
8. The proposal would also be contrary paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 which requires proposals to be sympathetic to local character and history and function well and add to the overall quality of the area. The proposal would also be inconsistent with the overarching objective of the Council's SPD guidance that notes (in paragraph 5.4.5) that particular care needs to be taken where the house is located at the corner of a cul-de-sac or banjo which derive a good deal of their character from open corner spaces. It is confirmed, as is the case for this proposal, that an extension that compromises the openness of the plot could have a detrimental impact on the street scene and be considered unacceptable.

Other Matters

9. I note the appellant's need for additional living space but this is a private factor that does not alter my findings. A lack of impact upon neighbouring residential amenity is noted, however, this is a neutral consideration. The appellant has stated that the proposal could be deemed as permitted development in most situations, however, this is submitted as (and falls to be considered as) a householder application for planning permission. Furthermore, for permitted development, side extensions should generally be no more than one storey and no more than half the width of the original house. In this case I have no evidence of such a fallback position which could be attributed any weight in the consideration of this proposal before me.
10. I note that appellant states that the proposal before me is considerably smaller in size and improved design compared to a previously refused application. Whilst I note from Council's submissions that a previous appeal¹, for a two storey side extension, was dismissed I do not have copies of previous

¹ APP/Z5060/D/21/3279626

submissions before me. It falls to consider the proposal before me as submitted against the Local Plan as the starting point for determination.

11. Passing reference is made to the proposal preserving architectural elements of houses of similar design within the neighbourhood but no examples have been provided for me to consider. Despite this each case must be considered on its own merits and I find that the circumstances of this case essentially hinge on the important location within a banjo.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR