



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2023

**by C Carpenter BA MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 06 MARCH 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/22/3308125**

**24 Lynnett Road, Dagenham, Barking and Dagenham RM8 1RL**

- 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 Tuli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
  - The application Ref 22/00593/FULL, dated 6 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2022.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a one bedroom bungalow at the land adjacent to 24 Lynnett Road.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a one bedroom bungalow at the land adjacent to 24 Lynnett Road, Dagenham, Barking and Dagenham RM8 1RL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00593/FULL, dated 6 April 2022, and the plans submitted with it, 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: Block Plan and HBS-130-12 Existing and proposed plans & elevations.
  - 3) The materials used in the external surfaces of the bungalow hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling at 24 Lynnett Road.
  - 4) The dwelling shall not be occupied until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with drawing no. HBS-130-12 for one bicycle to be parked and that space shall thereafter be kept available for the parking of bicycles.

## Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has submitted the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham (LBBD) Draft Local Plan Regulation 19 Consultation Version (DLP) for examination. I am not aware of the exact stage it has reached, the extent of unresolved objections or whether the policies concerned will be considered consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Consequently, in accordance with paragraph 48 of the Framework, I give it limited weight.

## **Main Issue**

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing house and surrounding area.

## **Reasons**

4. The appeal site comprises a corner plot with one house at the end of a short terrace of four houses. There are similar terraces perpendicular to and opposite this one, forming a 'U' shape within a cul-de-sac. This arrangement is described by the Council as a 'banjo' cul-de-sac because of the shape of the footpath providing access to it from the highway.
5. The existing house is of a modest two-storey design with a pitched, tiled roof and pebbledash finish. Although there is a gap between this house and the one immediately perpendicular to it, the impression from the road is of a continuous group of dwellings. Views across rear gardens can only be seen when standing close to the gap between the appeal site and the adjacent house.
6. The cul-de-sac is part of the Becontree Estate. This is a very extensive inter-war municipal housing development, referred to in Policy CP2 of the LBBD Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy (CS); and Policy BP2 of the LBBD LDF Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (BWDP).
7. There is a high degree of uniformity in the original design of the dwellings within the Becontree Estate, although street layouts vary. The estate includes several 'banjo' cul-de-sacs of different sizes. These are described by the Council as having a distinctive openness at their entrance and around their corners, where houses on corner plots comprise large wrap-around gardens.
8. The proposed bungalow would adjoin the host property, set well back from the existing building line. Its footprint would be irregular in shape and larger than that of the original house. However, the area of frontage visible from the public realm would appear parallel and similar in width to that of its neighbour. The roofline of the proposed bungalow would be significantly lower than, and therefore subordinate to, that of the host property. Although different in form, with the inclusion of a rear dormer, the tiling and pitch of the proposed roof would respect the style of the existing house. The use of matching materials would also show regard for the original design and could be controlled by condition.
9. The position of the proposed bungalow would only restrict existing views of rear gardens from a position directly facing the original house. A gap between the bungalow and the neighbouring house would remain. The remaining area of land occupied by rear gardens would still be spacious. As a result, there would be only limited change to the overall sense of openness at this end of the 'banjo'. There would be little change in openness or to the symmetry of the group of houses when viewed from the street or from further down the cul-de-sac.
10. I have considered the Council's argument that the grant of planning permission would set a precedent for other similar developments in the Becontree Estate. It has also been put to me that this proposal is larger than others of its type in the area. Corner plots in other cul-de-sacs on the estate vary in size, shape and orientation. I observed that some of these have already been developed,

including some schemes of a similar scale to the appeal proposal. Each application and appeal must be determined on its individual merits, so generalised concerns of this nature do not justify withholding permission in this case.

11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed bungalow would not harm the character and appearance of the existing house or surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy D4 of the London Plan (LP); Policies CP2 and CP3 of the LBBB LDF CS; Policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the LBBB LDF BWDP; LBBB Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document; or the Framework. These policies seek good design that respects local character, distinctiveness, context and history, and helps create a sense of place.
12. I also find no conflict with draft Policies SP2, DMD1, DMD4 and DMD6 of the LBBB DLP, which seek to promote high quality design that responds positively to local distinctiveness, character, heritage and site context.

### **Other Matters**

13. The Council has suggested a parking survey be undertaken to demonstrate sufficient capacity for on-street parking for future occupants of the proposed bungalow. The proposal does not include off-street parking and is consistent with Policies T6 and T6.1 of the LP in that respect. The public transport access level is moderate. I have been provided with little evidence that on-street parking stress is an issue in this location. I therefore consider a parking survey would not be necessary.

### **Conditions**

14. I have considered the possible conditions mentioned within the Council's decision report.
15. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. A condition on materials is necessary to integrate the appearance of the proposed bungalow with that of the host dwelling. The condition on cycle storage is necessary to promote cycling and accord with Policy T5 of the LP.
16. I do not consider a pre-commencement condition requiring prior approval of a Construction Logistics Plan is necessary given the scale and location of this development.

### **Conclusion**

17. For the above reasons, having had regard to the development plan as a whole, the Framework and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*C Carpenter*

INSPECTOR