



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2023

by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/23/3317226

476 Ripple Road, Barking IG11 9RY

- 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 Tariq Butt against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01913/FULL, dated 10 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a new self-contained 3 bedroom dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.
3. Having visited site, I note that the host property has been extended with large rear and dormer extensions. These elements are not shown on the appeal drawings and would alter the overall appearance of the proposed development. However, the extensions would not preclude the proposed development from taking place and as such, I have considered the appeal based on the drawings submitted.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located in a residential area on a prominent corner which forms a gateway to the historic Becontree Estate. Although not perfectly symmetrical the junction appears open and well balanced, with the built form of the surrounding properties including the host property, set back from the highway. The host property is a two-storey semi-detached house with a projecting front gable characteristic of the area.

6. The proposal would be set down from the ridge of the host property and back from the front gable. It would be constructed using matching materials with similar window proportions. I note that the proposal has been amended following pre-application discussions, however, due to its substantial width and height, it would appear as an independent dwelling and would dominate the host property. Notwithstanding the single storey garage at No 478 or the differences in windows and render, the proposal would unbalance the existing semi-detached pair.
7. The proposed dwelling would be set in from the side boundary and would respect the building line of Ripple Road. Whilst a reasonable separation distance would be retained to the rear, the proposal would project significantly beyond the established building line of Tudor Road. Due to its corner plot position and overall bulk, it would appear unduly dominant within the street scene. It would fill the existing gap on site and would appear incongruous when viewed in comparison to the existing pattern of development surrounding the junction. Although key views would not be blocked, the approach to the Becontree Estate and the wider street scene would be harmfully affected by the loss of openness.
8. My attention has been drawn to several other properties in the wider area. However, I note fundamental differences to the appeal proposal, including the orientation of the properties on site and their relationship with surrounding dwellings. As such, the context differs to that of the scheme before me, and so it does not lead me to a different view in this case.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area, in conflict with Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan (March 2021) (LP), Policies CP2 and CP3 of the Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy (July 2010) (CS), Policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011) (DPD). Amongst other matters these policies seek to ensure development recognises local character and promotes good design whilst protecting and enhancing historic environments.
10. There would also be conflict with the aims of the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.

Planning Balance

11. The parties agree that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply. As a result, paragraph 11 d) ii of the Framework is engaged. The Council's Housing Delivery Test indicates a substantial shortfall.
12. The Framework requires that developments add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and layout and are sympathetic to local character. I have concluded that the proposal would appear unduly dominant and incongruous, harming the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Therefore, the conflict between the proposal and Policies D1 and D4 of the LP, Policies CP2 and CP3 of the CS, Policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the DPD and the Framework should be given significant weight in this appeal.

13. Nevertheless, the Framework seeks to boost the housing supply and highlights the important contribution small sites can make, whilst supporting development which makes efficient use of land. The proposal would make an efficient use of previously developed land, providing an additional family dwelling in an accessible location, contributing towards the boroughs housing supply, and identified need for family housing. However, one additional dwelling would make little difference to the overall supply of housing, even though the shortfall in supply is substantial. Therefore, these benefits would be of moderate weight.
14. Consequently, the adverse impacts of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Hence, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

15. Overall, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan, as a whole, and there are no material considerations, including the provisions in the Framework and the benefits of the proposal, which indicate that the development should be determined other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

K Allen

INSPECTOR