



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/23/3314928

1 Yew Tree Gardens, Chadwell Heath, Romford RM6 6TH

- 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 Dr Charanjiv Singh Bal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 22/01873/HSE, dated 7 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "*Outbuilding Summer house, Gym, Games room, Storage room home office Building*"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The decision notice refers to policies within the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Draft Local Plan 2037 (Regulation 19 Submission Version, December 2021). I note that the Draft Local Plan is at an advanced stage of adoption. However, there is insufficient information before me to establish whether the policies referred to by the Council are the subject of any unresolved objections. As such, I afford limited weight to the policies in the emerging Local Plan.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow that has been extended to the rear. It is situated in a residential street comprising a mix of detached and semi-detached bungalows of similar age and appearance. The property has a relatively long rear garden that is bounded by the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties in Adelaide Gardens and Cedar Avenue and by the rear garden of 3 Yew Tree Gardens. The surrounding gardens include a variety of outbuildings situated close to their rear boundaries. Most of these are small and subordinate in footprint to the gardens within which they are situated.
5. The proposal comprises the erection of a single-storey building within the rearmost part of the garden. The application submission indicates that it would

be used as a summer house, gym, games room and/or a home office. The proposal would occupy almost the full-width of the rear part of the garden and its internal floor area would be similar to that of a standard one-bedroom flat. It would have a hipped roof which would cover a veranda area on the side facing the retained area of garden.

6. Due to its footprint, height, design and form the proposal would be more akin to the surrounding bungalows than the nearby outbuildings. It would not be subordinate in scale to the host dwelling nor would it be compatible with the scale of ancillary outbuildings in the area. Consequently, it would be an overly prominent and incongruous intervention.
7. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. It therefore fails to accord with Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policy CP3 of the Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy (2010) and Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011). Amongst other matters these policies seek to ensure development recognises local character and promotes good design. There is also conflict with the aims of the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR