



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2024 by N Unwin BSc (hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Ben Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/24/3347203

23 Sheepcotes Road, Barking and Dagenham, Chadwell Heath RM6 5LS

- 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 Gurjan Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 24/00261/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as construction of a single storey front extension including porch, a part two storey part single storey side extension and a part two storey part single storey rear 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 Matters

3. The Barking and Dagenham 2037 Local Plan [2024] (LP) was adopted by the Council on 18 September 2024. In refusing planning permission, the Council referred to policies of The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Core Strategy (2010) and The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Borough Wide Development Plan Document (2011) which have subsequently been superseded. This does not fundamentally affect the reasons for refusal or the appellant's case in this regard. I have proceeded on this basis and referred to the most up to date development plan at the time of writing.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal forms a two-storey semi-detached dwelling on a corner plot. The area is characterised by modest two-storey dwellings, set back from the highway, maintaining the openness of the public realm. A number of these properties have been extended, I note the appellant's reference to permissions at 21 Sheepcotes Road and 31 Sheepcotes Road. Nevertheless, these alterations appear proportionate to the host dwellings and do not involve two-

storey side extensions to corner plots, thus maintaining the area's attractive open character.

6. The appeal property is of a modest scale, located adjacent to Sheepcotes Road and an open area of green space, enhancing its prominence within the street scene. An outbuilding and lean-to adjoin the boundary with the open green space. The appellant has drawn my attention to the lawful development certificates issued (24/00258/PRIEXT and 24/00276/CLUP) at the appeal site for a rear extension and outbuilding respectively. The single storey scale of these limits their visibility from the public realm, maintaining the openness between the main body of the dwelling and adjoining green space.
7. The proposed development would result in the two-storey side extension abutting the boundary with the green space, eroding the existing open nature of the area and increasing its prominence when viewed from the public realm. The proposed side extension would project significantly to the rear, substantially increasing the built form at first-floor level at the site boundary. It would thus appear conspicuous and imposing when viewed from the highway and particularly from the adjoining green space. Whilst the roof of the proposal would be marginally below that of the appeal dwelling and the front elevation slightly recessed, this would fail to negate its bulk and dominating effect on the host property. The proposed side and rear extensions would introduce a second and third ridge height, resulting in the rear of the dwelling appearing convoluted and confused, harming the existing modest simplicity of the host property.
8. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), and LP Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD6, which when read together require new development to be of high-quality design and relate to its local context. The proposal would additionally conflict with the aims of the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012) which, amongst other things, requires extensions to be sympathetic to the host property.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposed development would not accord with the development plan, when taken as a whole, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR