



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2024

by Nick Bowden BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/23/3322336

169 Hardie Road, Dagenham RM10 7BT

- 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 Artur Meshi against the decision of the Council for the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 23/00084/FULL, dated 17 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two bed house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have noted references to policies SP2, SP4 and DMD1 of the Draft Barking and Dagenham Local Plan 2021 in the Council's decision notice and officer report. However, this document is not presently adopted and does not form part of the statutory development plan. I have therefore applied limited weight to these policies in this decision.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised in December 2023. As the changes do not materially affect the main issues in this case, the parties have not been invited to make further comments.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is set within a suburban area formed, predominantly, of small rows of terraced houses. The site itself is an end terrace, one of three which all address a small green that is set between Hardie Road and Dagenham Road. There is a pleasing symmetry to these homes which directly address the green and provides an interesting local feature to the area. There is space to the side of number 169 and also to 786 Dagenham Road at the opposing end of the terrace. This allows for vistas along both Hardie Road and Dagenham Road.
6. The proposed new dwelling would be formed as an extension to number 169. It would unbalance the manner in which this row of terraces addresses the small green and the increased width of the built form would close off and disrupt views along Hardie Road. This would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

7. For these reasons I conclude that the development would fail to comply with policies D1, D4 and D8 of The London Plan 2021 (LonP) and BP11 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Plan Document 2011 (BDDPD) and the Framework. These policies, amongst other things, aim to protect or enhance the character and appearance of the areas in which they are located.
8. I have noted reference to policy CP2 of the Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy 2010 in the Council's decision notice. However, this policy relates to protection of the historic environment and no heritage assets on, or in the vicinity of, the appeal site have been drawn to my attention.

Other Matters

9. The appellant suggests the increase in width of the proposed dwelling by 320mm in order to render the internal floor area compliant with the Nationally Described Space Standards by providing additional storage space. This does not alter my reasoning or conclusions as set out above.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

10. The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year land supply of deliverable housing sites and the undersupply is acknowledged as significant by the Council. Consequently, the provisions of paragraph 11(d)ii of the Framework should be applied.
11. The Framework makes it clear that due weight should be given to existing policies according to their degree of consistency with the Framework. The proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The Framework seeks to ensure that development creates spaces with a high standard of design, and I give significant weight to the conflict between the proposal and policies D1, D4 and D8 of the LonP and BP11 of the BDDPD.
12. Set against the identified harm, the proposal would make an efficient use of land within an existing urban area and meet the Framework's objectives of boosting the supply of housing. However, the benefits associated with a single new dwelling would be minimal in the context of the Borough's overall shortfall. Nevertheless, given the apparent persistence of the housing supply shortage, I must give the provision of this additional dwelling, in these circumstances, moderate weight. Overall, however, the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposed dwelling would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The conflict I have found means that the development would not comply with the policies of the development plan, read as a whole. There are no other material considerations, including the benefits of providing an additional dwelling, that would warrant a decision other than in accordance with the development plan and therefore the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Bowden

INSPECTOR