



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2024

**by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 5 April 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/24/3337100**  
**74 Beccles Drive, Barking IG11 9HY**

- 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 Asan Shahid against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
  - The application Ref 23/01591/HSE, dated 16 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2023.
  - The development proposed is the construction of a part single, part 2-storey rear extension and a part first floor side extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey end terrace house within a mainly residential area, which is characterised largely by terraces and semi-detached properties. From what I saw, several buildings close to the site include sizeable extensions that are visible from either the site or the road and these vary in scale, design, and general appearance. There is, therefore, some variety to the existing built form within the street scene and the local area to which No 74 belongs.
4. Like several other properties along Beccles Drive, No 74 has been altered and extended. In particular, the hipped end to the main roof has been converted to a gable and a flat roof dormer has been placed onto the extended rear roof slope. There is also a ground floor projection that wraps around the side and part of the rear elevation to the main house.
5. The proposal includes a part single storey, part 2-storey extension to the rear of the appeal property. The new ground floor element would include a flat roof and extend outwards from the main 2-storey rear wall by some distance into the garden. There would also be a new, smaller first floor component with a hipped roof that would be set back from the rear wall below.
6. When seen from the back garden of No 74, the new rear elevation would be overwhelmed by the considerable scale and mass of the proposed extension, the bulk of which would be accentuated by the visually strong horizontal line of

its rearward projecting flat roof. The overall size of the new rear addition could not reasonably be described as subordinate to the house, which is normally expected of extensions in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Residential Extensions and Alterations* (SPD).

7. The Council has recently confirmed that prior approval (PA) is not required for a single storey rear extension with depth of 6-metres and a maximum height of 3-metres on the site. A sizeable rear addition could therefore be introduced in any event, which is a realistic fallback position for the appellant. That said, the proposal includes a first-floor element, and it would differ in scale and design to the PA scheme. Given that few direct parallels can be drawn between the appeal and PA schemes, I attach limited weight to this alternative option.
8. The proposed development would also result in an awkward juxtaposition of rooflines with hipped, gable and flat roofs at different levels all in proximity. The resultant effect would be uneasy on the eye. I recognise that some other properties along Beccles Drive similarly include a variety of roof forms, including those to which the appellant has referred. However, these examples demonstrate the awkward relationship between the new roof forms and the host dwelling that would result in this case. Consequently, these examples do not lend support to the appeal.
9. When seen together with the previous rear alterations and extensions, the proposal would result in a cumbersome enlargement of the appeal dwelling. In the light of the cumulative impact on the host dwelling of other extensions, the proposal would be an overly large, unwieldy feature in the new rear façade due to its scale, design, and roof form. As a result, the rear extension would be incongruous and an unwelcome addition to the local area even among the varied built form of the wider terrace and considering the proposed use of materials to match those of the host building.
10. Having spent some time walking around the local area, I agree that there are some extensions to properties that are similar what is proposed here. While these extensions form part of the character of the area, their presence does not, however, necessarily signal that such developments are therefore acceptable. In any event, it is a key principle of the planning system that each proposal should be considered on its own merits. Having done so, my own conclusion is that the proposed changes at the rear would be on a scale where the form and character of the host dwelling would be unduly compromised and there would be a significant adverse impact on the surrounding area.
11. In reaching this view, I appreciate that little, if any, of the new rear extension would be visible from the road given its position at the back of the main house. It would, however, be visible from the back gardens of adjacent properties, which also form part of the area's character as it is experienced and appreciated by others.
12. My attention has also been drawn to a recent appeal decision at 58 Edgefield Avenue, Barking, which grants planning permission for a full width single storey rear extension with a depth of 6-metres. In that case, the Inspector noted the Council's earlier decision, which confirmed that prior approval was not required for a 6-metre, deep rear extension. However, to briefly reiterate, it is the combined effect of the existing and proposed extensions at the rear of No 74 that is objectionable in this instance. Those circumstances do not appear to be the same or similar to those in the appeal at No 58, where the main issue

related to the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and accompanying plans indicate that the host building had not been previously enlarged to include a gable end and a rear dormer. Therefore, I attach only modest weight to the appeal decision at No 58 in support of the appeal.

13. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed rear extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policy D4 of The London Plan, Policy CP3 of the Council's Planning for the future of Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy and Policies BP8 and BP11 of its Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document. These policies aim to ensure that development recognises local character and promotes good design. It is also at odds with the Framework, which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character and adds to the overall quality of the area.
14. The Council has also referred to various policies of The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Draft Local Plan 2037 (Submission Version). However, as this plan remains in draft form, its policies may change prior to adoption. Therefore, I attach limited weight to this emerging plan.
15. Once complete, the enlarged house would provide additional living space for the appellant. The living conditions of others would not be adversely affected. However, these matters do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.
16. The Council also raises some concerns in relation to the new side extension although, on balance, finds it to be acceptable. From the submitted evidence, I have no reason to reach a different conclusion on this part of the appeal scheme. However, from my inspection of the plans, the side addition is not clearly severable from the rear extension, which is objectionable. Therefore, I am unable to issue a split decision that grants planning permission solely for it.

## **Conclusion**

17. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
18. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, including the absence of objections from others, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Gary Deane*

INSPECTOR