Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2017

by David Spencer BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 12th December 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3185168
75 Davington Road, Dagenham RM8 2LR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Darryl Mintah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/01072/FUL, dated 25 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 21 August 2017.
- The development proposed is to create a double storey side extension to provide additional space.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No.75 Davington Road is one of a semi-detached pair of two storey houses with the neighbouring No.77 Davington Road within the Becontree Estate, a large municipal residential estate constructed in the inter-war period. Compared to the terraced blocks of house elsewhere on Davington Road the layout at the appeal site is more spaciously arranged with a moderate gap between No.75 and the maisonettes at Nos. 71 and 73 Davington Road and the larger gap on the bend of Davington Road between Nos. 77 and 79. Generally, the density and pattern of housing on Davington Road is tightly arranged such that the appearance and setting of the semi-detached appeal site provides an important degree of relief in the street scene. The original appearance and layout of the semi-detached pair is noticeable in both approaches along Davington Road.

4. I note that the two storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation and the ridge line set down so as to appear subservient to the host dwelling. It would however occupy the full width of the existing gap to the side of No.75 flush to the side boundary with Nos.71 and 73. The scale and massing of the two storey extension within this gap would harmfully erode the particular spaciousness provided by the appeal location as described above.

5. The appellant submits that a gap, generally larger than those found elsewhere on Davington Road, would remain. This would rely on no future enlargement at Nos. 71 and 73 but comparison to gaps elsewhere on Davington Road means generally very modest spaces between terraced blocks of housing. As set out
above the generous gaps around the semi-detached pair at Nos.75 and 77 respond to the curvature of Davington Road at this point and provide valuable spacious qualities in the street scene. Consequently, the partial enclosure of the existing gap at the appeal site would be significantly harmful to the original layout and appearance of this part of the Becontree Estate.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to other side extension examples in the vicinity of the appeal site. The extensions opposite at Nos. 50 and 52 Davington Road are evidently not recent and I have no information before me on their planning history. Similarly I have few details of the examples in Lodge Avenue and Markyate Road. In any event the appearance of these developments, particularly the enclosing of the gap between Nos. 50 and 52, does not persuade me that they should set the pattern for development on Davington Road.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy CP2 of the Barking & Dagenham Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2010 which recognises the Becontree Estate as part of the rich local history and requires development, amongst other things, to respect local context. It would also be contrary Policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Barking & Dagenham Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011 which require development proposals, amongst other things, to respect local context, protect or enhance local character and create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place through their layout, function and design. It therefore follows that the proposal would also conflict with the objective of the National Planning Policy Framework to secure high quality design.

Other Matters

8. I have carefully considered the impact of the proposal, including the two storey rear projection of the side extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.77 having particular regard to outlook and light levels. Notwithstanding its location to the south of No.77 the modest scale of the projection and distance away from the side boundary would not adversely affect outlook or light levels to this property. The appellant submits that the appeal proposal would also provide an improved standard of accommodation for his family. That may well be the case but this benefit together with the absence of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties would not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of this part of the Becontree Estate.

Conclusion

9. Accordingly, and having considered all other matters before me, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Spencer

Inspector.