



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2024 by M Long BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6TH September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/24/3339485

78 Mayswood Gardens, Dagenham RM10 8UT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Priya Thangavel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 23/01838/HSE.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension at 78 Mayswood Gardens, Dagenham RM10 8UT in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/01838/HSE, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 19/464/001 (Site Location and Block Plan) and 19/464/003 (Proposed Plans and Elevations).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the external elevations of the existing building.

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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. This section of Maywood Gardens is characterised by bungalows, many of which have substantial rear extensions. The appeal bungalow forms a semi-detached pair with 76 Mayswood Gardens (No 76), which has a large, rear extension up to two-storeys in scale. The unattached neighbour, 80 Mayswood Gardens (No 80), also has a rear projection of a substantial depth which is further lengthened by a canopy beyond this.

5. The proposal would extend the host dwelling to the same depth and would be considerably lower in height than the top of the extension at No 76. It would be shorter than the rear projection at No 80. While large in comparison to the footprint of the original bungalow, given the surrounding context, this would not be discordant and the proposal would sit comfortably between the neighbouring extensions.
6. The Barking and Dagenham Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012) sets out that a rear extension to a semi-detached house should not exceed 3.65 metres in depth. This guidance is clear that it seeks to ensure that there is no material loss of daylight and outlook to neighbouring properties. The Council has not identified any harm in that particular regard and from what I have seen, I find no reason to disagree. Furthermore, for the reasons set out, the depth of the proposal would not be harmful in character and appearance terms in this instance.
7. I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with Policy CP3 (High Quality Built Environment) of the Core Strategy (2010), and Policies BP8 (Protecting Residential Amenity) and BP11 (Urban Design) of the Borough Wide Development Plan Document (2011) which together, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development achieves high quality standards in relation to design and layout, and has regard to protecting local character. There would be no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.
8. Additionally, there would be no conflict with emerging Policies SP2 (Delivering a high quality designed and resilient built environment), DMD1 (Securing high-quality design) and DMD6 (Householder extensions and alterations) of the Council's Draft Local Plan 2037 (DLP) which together, amongst other things, seek to ensure that developments relate to their local context, demonstrate high-quality design and respect the character of the area.
9. The Council have mentioned conflict with Policy D4 of The London Plan (2021), which primarily relates to the design process and scrutiny. This Policy is principally strategic in nature and so has not been decisive in relation to the modest nature of the appeal scheme.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time period for commencement, I recommend a condition to require that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, which is necessary in the interests of certainty.
11. I also recommend a condition that matching external materials are used to ensure that the development positively relates to the character and appearance of the dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposal would accord with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

M Long APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR