



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 April 2025

by **C Mayes CMLI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/25/3359281

72 Lindisfarne Road, Dagenham, Barking and Dagenham RM8 2QU

- 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 Mubin Uddin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 24/01508/HSE.
 - The development proposed is a double storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of Nos 70 and 74 Lindisfarne Road, with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is half of a pair of semi-detached houses. Along with other houses in the area the appeal site is located toward the centre of its plot with modest gardens to the front and rear. Located close to the junctions with Bennett's Castle Lane and Lindsey Road, the rear garden to the appeal property tapers to converge with other neighbouring gardens resulting in a compact pattern of residential development.
4. The rear garden to No 70 Lindisfarne Road (No 70), the other half of the pair of semi-detached houses, mirrors the garden to the appeal property. The rear, tapering garden and rear elevation of No 74 Lindisfarne Road (No 74) face onto the garden of the appeal property. The gardens are divided by an assortment of low timber-panel fences.
5. The proposed two-storey extension would occupy much of the rear garden of the appeal property. At ground floor the proposed extension would follow the boundary lines of the property. It would be built up to the boundary with No 70 and leave only a narrow gap to the boundary with No 74, allowing access to the remainder of the garden. The first-floor element of the proposed extension would extend across much of the ground floor and would be finished with a hipped roof to match the host building.
6. The proposed development would result in substantial areas of blank wall on or close to the common boundaries with the neighbouring properties. No 74 has

windows at ground and first floor serving habitable rooms that face the proposed development. These windows are close to the common boundary. As such, the height and mass of the blank elevation of the proposed development would be a dominant feature when viewed from the rear of No 74 and its rear garden.

7. The proposed development would be seen obliquely from windows to habitable rooms to the rear of No 70. As such, the mass of the blank elevation of the proposed development would also dominate a substantial part of the aspect from these habitable rooms and the garden to No 70.
8. The orientation of the appeal property and neighbouring properties would also mean that the proposed development, due to its height and proximity, would result in a loss of daylight and sunlight to both neighbouring properties at different times of the day. Loss of daylight and sunlight to the garden and habitable rooms of No 74 would occur during the afternoon. This would result in an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of occupants of No 74.
9. Taking the above into account, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to outlook and light. Hence, it would conflict with Policies DMD1 and DMD5 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Local Plan, September 2024, and Policy D4 of The London Plan – The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, March 2021, which seek, among other things, that development considers the effect on and is respectful of the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge the proposed development would meet the appellant's need for increased living space for their family for the benefit of their health and wellbeing. However, this is not a benefit of sufficient weight to justify the harm identified above.
11. I also note that the appellant approached the occupants of neighbouring properties prior to applying for planning permission and received support from them. However, an absence of objections and such support in this respect are neutral factors.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

C Mayes

INSPECTOR