



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2024 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/24/3336482

63 Neasham Road, Dagenham, London, RM8 2LU

- 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 E Vavinskis against the decision of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01608/HSE, dated 17 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension and ground floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The Government has published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023) (the Framework). I have had regard to this document in reaching my conclusions.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated on a triangular corner plot within an established residential area. The property features a gable roof, a rear roof dormer extension and a single storey rear extension. The site lies within the Becontree Estate, a non-designated heritage asset, which is characterised by a mix of semi-detached properties and terraced dwellings that mostly feature hipped roofs. The pattern of development in the area is typified by cul-de-sacs and comparably spacious and open corner plots.
 6. I acknowledge that the appeal proposal seeks to address previous concerns expressed in a 2019 refusal of planning permission for extensions on the site.
-

However, although this may be the case, the proposed two-storey side extension would appear excessively bulky in contrast with the original dwelling, given its width, height, and overall scale. Whilst the appellant contends that the first-floor element would be reasonably set back from the side boundary, I find the separation gap would not be sufficient and would appear unreasonably close to the neighbouring dwelling at No 61. Although the proposal would provide a more intensive development of the existing plot, this would be at the expense of the characteristic openness of the corner plot, which would be significantly eroded as a result.

7. The resultant roof form would appear awkward due to its trapezoidal shape and the set down from the main ridge. Whilst I acknowledge that it was designed as such in order to make the two-storey extension appear subservient to the main dwelling, it would nevertheless appear as a clumsy and discordant addition. Whilst I accept that the proposed hipped roof would reinstate a degree of symmetry with the adjoining semi-detached property (No 65), the side extension would still appear incongruous and unreasonably large within the context of the plot.
8. I recognise that the proposed single storey front and side extension with integrated garage would resemble to a degree the existing front extension and garage at the adjoining property. However, the proposed width of the side extension, at 7.15 metres, would be unduly disproportionate against the existing property. Due to the prominent location of the site on a corner plot, the proposal would be easily visible and would erode the open character of the streetscene and distinctive character of the area.
9. For these reasons, the development would adversely impact the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding Becontree Estate. It would conflict with paragraph 135 of the Framework, Policy D1 and D8 of the London Plan (2021), Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy (2010)¹, Policy BP11 of the Council's Local Plan (2011)², and the *Residential Extensions and Alterations* Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2012) which together aim to ensure developments are well-designed and respect local character. The proposal would also conflict with Policy HC1 of the London Plan, Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy, and Policy BP2 of the Local Plan which seek to ensure proposals preserve or enhance non-designated heritage assets.
10. I note that the decision notice refers to Policy CR2 of the Core Strategy. However, as this policy relates to preserving and enhancing the natural environment, I do not find it to be of direct relevance in my assessment of the proposal.

Planning Balance and Recommendation

11. I have had regard to the examples of other development in the area referred to by the appellant. Nos 34 and 36 Neasham Road are not directly comparable to the scheme before me as they are end-of-terrace properties rather than semi-detached and contextually are not located on constricted triangular plots. With regards to the extension at No 29 Neasham Road, I do not have all the details relating to the circumstances in which that development was permitted. I note

¹ London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council, Local Development Framework, *Core Strategy*, adopted July 2010.

² London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council, Local Development Framework, *Borough Wide Development Policies - Development Plan Document*, adopted March 2011.

however that the extension would appear to have been in situ a considerable time, and that it most likely would have been approved under a different set of planning policies and standards. That being said, the roof and extensions of No 29 differ markedly in respect of their detailed design and size from the appeal scheme, and do not therefore justify the unacceptable design rationale followed in this instance.

12. The appellant also states that the effective use of land is encouraged in national planning policy and that the development would improve the living standards of the current occupiers. However, whilst this must attract some limited weight as a personal benefit, this must be balanced against the adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
13. Having regard to all the above, I have found that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, which is a non-designated heritage asset. This results in conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole, as well as the Framework. The limited benefits arising in this case would not outweigh this conflict.
14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR