



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2023

by P Storey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/23/3314715

67 Raydons Road, Barking and Dagenham, Dagenham RM9 5JP

- 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 Imran Haider against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 22/01636/FULL, dated 10 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is single and part first floor rear extension, erection of one 2 x bedroom single dwelling house with associated car parking, waste / refuse storage and amenity space at 67 Raydons Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has referred to and has provided copies of the policies of The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Draft Local Plan 2037 – Second Revised Regulation 19 Consultation Version: Autumn 2021. I understand this is currently at the examination stage. However, I have limited evidence to suggest when the plan is likely to be adopted, if any policies have been modified, or the extent of any unresolved objections. Accordingly, I attach limited weight to this emerging plan.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises an end-terrace dwelling on a corner plot in a predominantly residential area. The corner location forms part of a crossroad junction, with dwellings positioned on all 4 corners of the junction. Although some properties have been extended and altered, including the dwelling directly opposite the appeal site, they retain similar architectural detailing and are laid out in a generally uniform pattern in terms of their relationship to the adjacent roads and neighbouring properties.
5. The Council's concerns relate to the side and rear 2-storey extensions, which comprise extensions to the existing dwelling and the creation of a new dwelling. The extensions would extend to the side boundary of the property which adjoins the footway of Springpond Road. The front elevation and front roof slope of the extension would be set back from those of the existing dwelling. The proposals would incorporate a hipped roof, with the ridge being

set lower than the existing dwelling. The 2-storey rear extension would follow the extended side elevation along the side boundary of the property and further to the rear. This would feature a pair of hipped roofs with a valley running between them.

6. Although the property currently features a flat-roofed side projection, it retains a sense of spaciousness between the 2-storey side elevation and the side boundary. By extending the 2-storey massing to the side boundary, the spaciousness would be significantly eroded and the dwelling would encroach uncomfortably on the adjacent highway of Springpond Road.
7. I acknowledge that the set-back front elevation and lower ridge height in comparison to the existing dwelling seeks to mitigate the bulk of the proposed development. However, the property is part of a terrace of several dwellings that features a characteristic uniformity to the frontage and roofscape, with this characteristic also being shared with the neighbouring properties bordering the crossroad junction. The proposal would fail to reflect the traditional massing and proportions of the adjoining terrace and the neighbouring dwellings and would stand out as an unsympathetic addition to the streetscape.
8. Due to the corner position of the site, the extensions to the rear would be prominently visible from publicly accessible spaces along Springpond Road. The pair of hipped roofs would appear incongruous in the context of the surroundings, due in part to their uncharacteristic design and the uncomfortable proximity to the side boundary.
9. I note other developments in the vicinity, including a property on the corner of Raydons Road and Page Close. However, this property retains a grass verge between the side elevation of the property and the footway. Although not of a substantial size, this preserves a sense of separation. The property is also of a distinctly different appearance and character to that of the host property. Given these factors, I give limited weight to this and other neighbouring examples in my decision.
10. Although the new dwelling formed by the proposed extension would be narrower than the other dwellings within the terrace, I do not find this specifically to be a harmful factor. The terrace appears originally to have been formed of 7 dwellings, with the length and uneven number providing a limited sense of symmetry. The appearance and position of fenestration would also broadly relate to the neighbouring dwellings. However, given the matters discussed above, the lack of harm in this regard is a neutral factor that does not weigh in favour of the proposals.
11. For the above reasons, by virtue of its scale, appearance and siting, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan – March 2021, Policies CP2 and CP3 of the Local Development Framework 'Planning for the future of Barking and Dagenham' Core Strategy – Adopted July 2010, and Policy BP11 of the Local Development Framework 'Planning for the future of Barking and Dagenham' Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document – Adopted March 2011. Together these policies seek, among other objectives, to deliver good growth through good design, to achieve high quality standards of design and layout, to maintain the design quality of development through to completion, to provide attractive, high-quality architecture and landscaping, and to reinforce local distinctiveness. It would also conflict with

the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which has similar aims.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

12. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning decisions to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
13. The Council confirms it is currently unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. As such, in accordance with footnote 8 of the Framework, paragraph 11 d) (ii) of the Framework applies to the proposal. This directs that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
14. I have found that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, which weighs substantially against the proposal. However, the scheme would create an additional dwelling which would provide a small but meaningful contribution to the Council's housing stock. This carries moderate weight in favour of the proposal.
15. Taking the above factors into account, in terms of paragraph 11 d) (ii) of the Framework, the adverse impacts of granting planning permission, in terms of the harm relating to my findings on the main issue above, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposed development, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
16. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan, the Framework and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P Storey

INSPECTOR