



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2024

by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/24/3351427

476 Ripple Road, Barking IG11 9RY

- 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 Tariq Butt against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 24/00025/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a 2 bedroom dwelling to land adjoining 476 Ripple Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the determination of the application, the Council have adopted a new Local Plan, the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Local Plan 2020-2037 in September 2024 (LP). The new LP has superseded the Core Strategy and the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document which were cited on the Council's decision notice. I have therefore determined the appeal with the newly adopted Local Plan in mind.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has also been revised since the determination of the application by the Council. However, as the policies in the Framework that are material to this decision have not fundamentally changed, I am satisfied that this has not prejudiced any party and I have therefore made my decision in accordance with the revised Framework.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and on highway safety with particular regard to car parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site is located in a largely residential area at the corner of Ripple Road and Tudor Road. The area forms an approach to the Becontree estate (which is a non-designated heritage asset), whilst to the south is Eastbury Manor House which is a grade I Listed Building.
6. The dwellings within the vicinity of the appeal site are in the main semi-detached properties or terraced blocks of two storey proportions with hipped roofs of a simple

design with some properties (including the appeal address) having a front gable projection which provides a 'bookend' appearance to the pair of semi-detached dwellings. Corner plots also have areas of space to the side which provides for an open and spacious feel to the overall area.

7. The proposal would be located on the garden area to the side of the existing semi-detached property and would introduce a new two storey dwelling on a corner plot.
8. The new dwelling would follow the building line along Ripple Road, and in that sense, it would fit in with the existing pattern of development. However, the same cannot be said with the relationship of the proposal to Tudor Road. The new dwelling would project a considerable amount forward of the established building line and would seriously erode the spacious character of this corner plot to the harm of the streetscene and the overall character of the area. It would also represent a significant increase in built form on the site.
9. Turning to the design of the property, this has clearly been influenced by the design of the existing host property. Notwithstanding that, it differs in that the new dwelling would be much narrower than the existing dwelling and this, when combined with the projecting gable element would seriously unbalance the existing pair of semi-detached dwellings and the 'bookend' design.
10. Furthermore, the roof of the proposal would join onto the existing side facing box dormer window. Whilst the resultant ridge line would be lower than the main house roof, this arrangement would look odd. The differing roof pitch of the front gable projection also adds another inconsistent element to the property design. Overall, the appearance of the proposed dwelling would be at odds with the host dwelling and the overarching character of the area as a whole.
11. In coming to the above views, I acknowledge that the proposal has evolved following the refusal of previous planning applications. That said, the current proposal still represents an unacceptable development which would be harmful to the overall character and appearance of the area.
12. I have also had regard to an appeal decision¹ for a different site which the appellant has drawn to my attention. Whilst this proposal was also for a new dwelling on a corner plot, its context with the existing built form is significantly different to the proposal before me, and as a result I therefore give this little weight in my decision. Moreover, each proposal should be considered on its individual merits.
13. As noted above, the proposal would harm the streetscene as a result of the erosion of the spacious feel of the corner plot. This would also give rise to some limited harm to the approach to the Becontree Estate, which is a non-designated heritage asset. Therefore, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. In this case, it is common ground that key views would not be blocked and I have no reason to disagree with that view. However, the wider streetscene would be harmfully affected by the loss of openness at this corner plot and this adds further weight to the harm I have identified above.
14. Turning to the setting of Eastbury Manor House, this is located at the southern end of Tudor Road. That said, the proposal would not have any discernible impact to

¹ Appeal reference APP/Z5060/W/22/3312798 – 1 Romsey Road Dagenham

the setting of the house owing to its distance away from the property and the intervening residential development along Tudor Road and around the Listed Building itself. In that sense, I am of the view that the proposal would preserve its setting and not result in any harm to it.

15. Finally, the Council has referred to the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012) in their decision. However, from the evidence before me, this document refers to extensions to existing properties, rather than new independent dwellings. As such I have given this very little weight in my decision.
16. For the above reasons, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policies D1 and D4 of The London Plan (2021), Policies SP2 and DMD1 of the LP which, amongst other matters, seek to deliver a high quality environments which ensures that developments relate to their local context, including heritage assets. It would also conflict with the overarching aims of the Framework.

Parking

17. The appeal proposal is located in an area with a PTAL (Public Transport Access Level) rating of 2 which means that it has poor access to public transport. Having said that, from the evidence before me and what I observed on site, there are bus stops very close to the appeal site and Upney underground station is only a short walk away. Having said that, in such locations proposals should provide appropriate parking provision.
18. The appeal plans indicate two parking spaces, one for the existing property and one for the proposal which would be to the property frontage. Both spaces would be accessed from Tudor Road.
19. As I understand it, at the time of the application, neither of these accesses were existing. I note that the appellant has indicated that a dropped kerb had been approved and at my site visit I noted that there appeared to be a recent dropped kerb installation towards the front of the appeal site. However, the position of this dropped kerb is not consistent with the location of the proposed parking area for the new dwelling, being located partially in front of the side wall of the existing property.
20. Notwithstanding that, the dropped kerb does not in itself form part of the planning application as it would be located outside of the application site. Given the position of the recently installed drop kerb I am not convinced that, on the basis of the evidence before me, that a safe and suitable access to this frontage parking space can be achieved. Furthermore, if the access was moved closer to the road junction with Ripple Road, this would be likely to be sited extremely close to the road junction and would be likely to result in an unacceptable increase in highway danger. To that end, I consider that the proposal does not provide for a useable parking space for the new dwelling.
21. Turning to the proposed space to the rear of the site, this is shown as an oddly shaped area with car parking at an angle to Tudor Road. Additionally, the size of the parking area does not appear to conform to any recognised design standard for such as space. As such, I consider that the space provided is inadequate to be considered as a parking space.

22. I also note that the proposal would result in the loss of on-street parking provision in a controlled parking zone which would need to be amended. No mechanism has been put forward to address this.
23. At the time of my site visit, there was ample parking spaces available along Tudor Road. However, I am conscious that my visit was only a snapshot in time and would not be fully representative of the parking situation throughout the day and evening time where such demand is likely to be considerably greater.
24. In the absence of any information to safely conclude that the proposal would not contribute to parking stress in the area, and on the basis of the inadequacy of the on-site parking provision for the existing and proposed dwellings, I am unable to safely conclude that the proposal would not unacceptably increase parking stress in the area.
25. In coming to the above view, I acknowledge that the Appellant has set out that this parking reason for refusal was not included in any of the previous decisions at the site. However, from the appellants statement I was able to see that each proposal had different parking arrangements. Nevertheless, a new access has been included on each scheme, and it is unclear why this had not been previously raised in this manner in previous decisions. However, I must determine the appeal on its planning merits, and as I have set out above, the proposal would not provide suitable parking provision for either the existing or proposed dwelling.
26. For the above reasons the proposal does not demonstrate suitable parking arrangements for the existing or proposed dwelling. In the absence of sufficient information to demonstrate that it would not result in an unacceptable increase in parking stress, the proposal does not provide for a suitable parking strategy for the development. As a result, the proposal would be contrary to Policy T6 of the London Plan and Policy DMT2 of the LP which amongst other matters seek to ensure that new development provides for suitable parking provisions or strategies to mitigate any harm arising from the development.

Other Matters

27. I have also had regard to the comments raised in the representations including matters relating to privacy, daylight/overshadowing, overdevelopment of the site, construction noise, loss of green space, strain on local services and infrastructure, as well as traffic, parking and road safety issues. However, none of the issues raised provide for a further compelling reason why planning permission should be withheld.

Planning Balance

28. The Council has set out that the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within paragraph 11 d) of the Framework is engaged. The latest Housing Delivery Test results also set out that the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies.
29. In this case, I have found that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, which is a non-designated heritage asset, and that the proposal would not provide suitable parking provision. To my mind, these weigh very heavily against allowing the proposed development.

30. That said, the proposal would provide a much-needed additional dwelling which would contribute to future housing delivery. Additionally, the development would bring social benefits as a result of an additional dwelling and economic benefits from the construction process together with the ongoing occupation of the dwelling. However, these benefits are limited in the overall balance.
31. Taking all of the above factors into account, whilst there are obvious benefits arising from the proposal in terms of housing delivery, I consider that the harm to the character and appearance of the area and the lack of parking provision would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme when assessed against the policies in the Framework when taken as a whole. The proposal cannot therefore be considered to be sustainable development.

Conclusion

32. For the above reasons the proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR