
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 March 2025 by M Jones

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/24/3356502

138 Bradfield Drive, Barking IG11 9AS

- 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 Shah Shahidur Rahman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 24/01297/HSE.
 - The development proposed is construction of a two-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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey end of terrace dwelling with an adjoining accessway located on Bradfield Drive which is a residential street. The part of the street in which the appeal dwelling is located is made up of two storey terraced dwellings of broadly similar proportions, form and scale. Further, the roofs of these dwellings appear largely uniform in relation to scale, pitch, ridge line and materials. The similarity of form, scale and roof treatment of these dwellings is a positive and significant part of the character of the local area.
5. The proposed development would significantly increase the size and footprint of the existing dwelling, which would be clearly visible due to the prominent position of the appeal dwelling at the end of the terrace. The two-storey side and rear extensions would add considerable bulk to the front and side elevations of the dwelling, making it appear substantially larger and therefore more dominant in the streetscene than neighbouring properties.
6. The proposed side extension would not be set back from the frontage of the house so would appear as a continuation of the terrace, with this reinforced by the use of matching materials. The width would, however, be less than that of other dwellings

in the terrace, while the step down in ridge height partway across the extension would be distinctly at odds with the placement of the large windows in the front elevation. As a result, the size, balance and proportions of the appeal dwelling, particularly relative to its neighbours, would be fundamentally and harmfully altered. Consequently, it would appear as a discordant addition to the terrace.

7. Further, the introduction of the staggered roof would disrupt the ridge line of the existing dwelling, diluting the broad uniformity of the ridge lines of the terraces on the street and altering this positive aspect of the character and appearance of the local area. The staggered roof would be particularly visible at the end of the terrace, exacerbating the impact. Therefore, while the roof design does reduce the bulk of the proposed extension when viewed from the side, it does not adequately take into account, or respond to, the positive aspects of the existing roofscape of the appeal dwelling and the local area.
8. Consequently, the proposed extensions would add a discordant and unsympathetic element to the street scene, harming and undermining the broadly uniform appearance of the terrace which is a positive element of the wider area. Due to their size, scale and design, the proposed extensions would not appear subordinate to the existing dwelling. For these reasons, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of both the existing appeal dwelling and the local area.
9. The appellant argues that there are similar extensions in the local area demonstrating a precedent for this kind of development but has not provided details of any specific examples. From visiting the site, I saw a small number of terraces with extensions in the local area. However, those extensions are seen in a different context to that of the appeal site, appear less prominent in the street scene and are of a generally smaller scale than the appeal proposal. In any event, planning decisions are determined on their own merits and, in this case, the existence of other extensions and alterations in the local area does not outweigh the harm the proposed development would cause to both appeal dwelling and street scene as outlined above.
10. Accordingly, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and local area contrary to Policies DMD1, DMD5 and SP2 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Local Plan 2020-2037 (2024) and Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021, which require high quality design which respects and complements local character.
11. It would also conflict with the guidance in the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012) and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework which require that developments be of a high quality design as well as subordinate and sympathetic to the design of the original dwelling and that developments should account for positive aspects of the existing roofscape.

Other matters

12. The appellant indicates that the potential impacts on neighbours have been appropriately addressed in the proposal. However, impact on neighbours' living conditions was not one of the Council's reasons for refusal and, at best, this would be a neutral matter. Therefore, it does not outweigh my findings on the main issue and, consequently, there is no need for me to consider potential effects of living conditions further in this appeal.

13. The increased living space resulting from the proposal would be a private benefit for the appellant, so I give this only limited weight. The appellant also suggests that the proposal would be sustainable development, in that it would reduce the need for new housing construction. However, I am unable to speculate on what may or may not be built in lieu of this particular proposal and can only base my recommendation on the facts before me. Therefore, I give this limited weight.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I find that there are no material considerations, including the benefits of the proposal, which outweigh the harm identified and the resulting conflict with development plan policies. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Jones

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

L McKay

INSPECTOR