



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2024

by M Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/24/3343457

30A Whalebone Lane South, Dagenham, RM8 1BB

- 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 Mr Z Aksu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 24/00253/FULL.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Barking and Dagenham Local Plan 2020-2037 (Local Plan) was adopted in September 2024 after the planning application had been refused. The policies of the Local Plan supersede the policies of the Borough Wide Development Plan Document and Core Strategy referred to in the reason for refusal. Both parties had the opportunity to comment on the implications of this for the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a two storey terrace property located on the corner of Whalebone Lane South and James Avenue at the end of a parade of shops. The property has a hipped roof with parapet detailing, together with a two storey flat roofed outrigger and a single storey extension to the rear. The side elevation of the property is set well back from James Avenue behind a wide pavement and an area of land enclosed by a wall and fencing. The property is a convenience store with a self-contained flat above. The proposed extension would occupy part of the enclosed land to the side of the property and provide additional accommodation within the flat.
5. The surrounding area is of mixed character and comprises various building sizes and styles, ranging from two storey terrace houses and shops to larger commercial buildings, such as the vehicle repair garage and the superstore on the western side of Whalebone Lane South. Buildings are generally arranged along linear building lines, with a strong street scene presence.
6. The proposal would feature a small hipped roof set below the existing hipped roof, with a larger area of flat roof and a parapet wall to match the existing.

While the extension would be set back a considerable distance from the front of the property, this would result in a disjointed relationship as neither the front nor the rear elevations of the extension would align with the front or rear of the existing building. The combination of the significant set back from the front elevation and the flat roof and low hip would result in a squat and block like appearance which would not integrate successfully with the form and proportions of the host property or the wider terrace.

7. Although some aspects of the proposal, including its external materials of construction, fenestration and parapet detailing, would be sympathetic to the existing building, its overall design and siting would be incongruous, resulting in harm to the street scene given its prominent position.
8. The Council is also concerned that the proposal would disrupt the symmetry between the host property and 28 Whalebone Lane South, which is located on the opposite side of James Avenue. However, given their differing roof heights and forms, and the walled enclosure to the side of the host property, there is not a strong sense of symmetry between them in any case.
9. The appellant says that the proposal is similar to other two storey extensions to properties on corner plots, but no substantive details have been provided and I did not observe any in the surrounding area during my site visit. I have therefore determined the appeal proposal on its own merits.
10. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It therefore conflicts with London Plan Policies D4 and D8 and Local Plan Policies SP2 and DMD1 which, amongst other things, seek to promote high quality design and development that makes a positive contribution to the character of the area. The reason for refusal also refers to a conflict with Local Plan Policy SP4. However, as this relates to delivering social and cultural infrastructure, it is not relevant to the main issue and there is no conflict with it.

Other Matters

11. Although I acknowledge that the proposal would provide more spacious accommodation in the flat, this is not a public benefit and does not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

12. I conclude that the proposal does not accord with the development plan and there are no other considerations that outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

M Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR