



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2024

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/24/3338927

4 Leys Avenue, Dagenham, RM10 9XR

- 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 H Nwazuruokeh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 23/01544/HSE.
 - The development proposed is construction of a double storey rear and single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a double storey rear and single storey side extension at 4 Leys Avenue, Dagenham, RM10 9XR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/01544/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 external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Proposed - Block Plan Location Plan, 04 OS 01 Rev 31/08/23; Proposed - Floor Plans – 04 HH 03, Rev 31/08/2023; Roof Plans – 04 HH 04, Rev 31/08/23; and Proposed – Elevations – 04 HH 06, Rev 31/08/23.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by an amended version on the decision notice and in subsequent appeal documents. I consider that subsequent description to accurately represent the proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision, although I am mindful that the single storey side extension is at first floor level.
3. Subsequent to its decision, the Council has adopted the Barking and Dagenham Local Plan 2024. The adopted Local Plan supersedes the policies of other development plan documents referred to in the Council's Decision, including the Core Strategy 2010, Development Plan Document 2011, and the Draft Local Plan Submission Version 2021. The Council has confirmed which policies of the adopted Local Plan it considers are relevant to the proposal, and the appellant has had the opportunity to comment on these. I will therefore determine this appeal on the basis of the adopted development plan.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the area, with due regard to heritage assets.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot. The dwelling and its attached neighbour are of an understated design, although the appeal site includes ground floor extensions to the dwelling and outbuildings in the rear garden.
6. The site is located within the Becontree Estate, which was originally developed to provide 'Home for Heroes' and is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The Council sets out that the estate is distinctive in its character which is derived from its homogeneous appearance and layout, and emphasises the importance of corner sites in contributing to the significance of this heritage asset.
7. The proposal would introduce a 2-storey extension to the rear, which would wrap around the corner of the dwelling to create a first floor extension to the side above an existing ground floor extension. However, the front elevation of the side extension would be set back from the main elevation of the host building, and the ridge of the roof would be lower than the main roof. The first floor of the rear extension would also be set back from the side gable of the resultant building, which would further reduce the bulk and massing of the development. Due to this design, and despite its projection above the ground floor, the proposal would be viewed as subservient to the host building and would enable the appreciation of the form of the dwelling and its attached neighbour.
8. Although the proposal would project into the spacing between the host building and the dwelling on the opposite corner plot across Wellington Drive, this would not lead to an unacceptable narrowing of the gap due to the significant separation distance. The dwellings on the opposite side of Wellington Drive are also of a different alignment to the appeal site, which reduces the homogeneity of the design and layout of buildings adjacent to this junction. The limited projection to the side would also mitigate for a potentially enclosing effect in views of the junction and along the streetscape. The proposal would also retain a suitable extent of garden space around the dwelling.
9. Even allowing for its location on a prominent corner plot, for the above reasons I conclude that the proposal would be of a scale and design that would not harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and the wider area. The proposal would also not harm the significance of the non-designated heritage asset of the Becontree Estate. The proposal would therefore not conflict with the design and heritage considerations of Policies SP2, DMD1, DMD4 and DMD5 of the Local Plan.
10. The proposal would also not be contrary to the advice of the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2012 in respect of double-storey side extensions on semi-detached dwellings.
11. In addition to the standard 3 year time limitation for commencement, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance

with the submitted plans in the interests of certainty. A condition is also required to ensure that external materials match those of the existing building in the interests of character and appearance.

12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR