



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/25/3363758

256 Westrow Drive, Barking, Barking and Dagenham IG11 9BT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Giash Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 25/00067/PRIEXT.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey rear extension with glass lantern roof above.
-

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 Matter and Main Issue

3. The description above is taken from the application form and varies from the decision notice which includes more specific information about the prior approval requirements. This has not changed anything fundamental nor prejudiced the ability of any party to make their case in respect of the appeal scheme. The main issue for which is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 258 Westrow Drive (No. 258) with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is an end terrace dwelling within a residential area. The property benefits from a garden to the rear that is in line with the gardens of the neighbours. The boundary between the appeal site and No. 258 is made up of fencing and similar height shrubs.
5. The proposal would introduce a rear extension almost immediately alongside the shared boundary with No. 258 that would extend further out than the neighbouring conservatory and considerably higher than the existing boundary fencing. The looming effect of the height, proximity and run of the extension would appear overbearing to users of the neighbouring conservatory and the outlook experienced from within. The scale of the proposed development would thus garner an unacceptable sense of enclosure for the occupiers of No.258. The position and length of the extension would also inevitably block some light to the conservatory

and kitchen of No. 258 being situated on the side where most light enters the rooms. The proposal would therefore cause harm to the living conditions of the occupants of the adjoining dwelling contrary to the amenity considerations of this part of the GPDO.

Other Matter

6. I have had regard to the other examples provided but assessment under the GPDO for the purposes of this main issue and the specific context of the appeal site does not allow one to weigh in other examples of similar development elsewhere.

Conclusion and Recommendation

7. For the reasons given above, the proposal would not accord with the prior approval matters set out in the above section of the GPDO. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.
8. The Council has referred to Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies DMD1 and DMD5 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Local Plan 2024 as well as their Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document. Whilst the issues they address issues related to those considered above and the appeal scheme would, consequently, conflict with their aims, as a submission under the prior approval regime, the development plan is not determinative.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR