



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2024 by S Indermaur

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/24/3344710

178 Western Avenue, Barking & Dagenham, Dagenham RM10 8UL

- 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 M Farhan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 24/00040/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as a 2.975m single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for development described as a 2.975m single storey rear extension at 178 Western Avenue, Barking & Dagenham, Dagenham RM10 8UL. In accordance with the terms of application 24/00040/HSE and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plan reference 02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in 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.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. The Council adopted the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Local Plan 2037 (2024) (LP) between the application being determined and this appeal. The main parties have commented on the relevant new policies, and I have had regard to the most up to date development plan at the time I make this recommendation. In addition, a single storey extension has been completed on site albeit not in accordance with the plans in the appeal which, for clarity and the fact the Council issued a decision on them, I have considered in my recommendation and referred to in conditions.
4. The Council have referred to the Becontree Estate albeit the plan which accompanies Policy SPP6 shows that the appeal site is outside of and some distance from the boundary thereof. I have assessed the scheme on this basis,

specifically with regard to its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two storey, end of terrace dwelling with a two-storey rear extension which has a hipped roof. Rear single storey extensions are found on the majority of properties within this terrace. The proposed single storey element would be a relatively small aspect of the overall alterations to the property, including what has gone before. In addition, the design, size and positioning of the proposed windows and doors would reflect the current arrangement. Furthermore, the materials would match the existing and surrounding dwellings, and the proposed roof form and height would be similar to roofscapes of single storey extensions within the immediate vicinity. Overall, there would be limited visibility of the extension from the street.
6. There would be a change to the rear building line of the terrace of which the appeal building is part, but this is far from uniform as it stands. For the reasons I have set out above, I do not consider such a change to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposed development would not conflict with Policies SP2, DMD 1 or DMD6 of the LP. Together, these policies seek developments that complement appearance, are sympathetic and subordinate to the design of the original dwelling and respect the local character of the area and group of buildings of which it forms a part. Further, there would be no conflict with the relevant parts of the Framework, which seeks development that is sympathetic to the local character amongst other things.
7. The Council have alleged conflict with The London Plan (2021), specifically Policy D4 which primarily relates to the design process and scrutiny. This Policy is principally strategic in nature and therefore has not been decisive in my findings. Policy SPP6 of the LP defines the Becontree Estate and the appeal property falls outside of the defined area referred to by Policies HC1 of the London Plan and DMD 4 of the Draft Plan. These policies also relate to heritage and therefore are not directly relevant to the main issue. I have not therefore considered the scheme thereunder.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, a condition is necessary for clarity and enforcement purposes requiring the development to come forward in accordance with the approved plans. A condition to ensure that the external finishing materials of the extension match those of the existing dwelling, in the interests of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and immediate area, is also necessary to ensure its suitability therefore.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The proposal would not conflict with the development plan and therefore I recommend it be allowed, subject to the above conditions.

S Indermaur

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 allowed, subject to the conditions set out.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR