



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 15 September 2021

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2021

Appeal A Ref: APP/Z5060/D/21/3272747

61 Hedingham Road, Dagenham, London, RM8 2NA

- 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 Mohammed Iqbal Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 20/02321/HSE, dated 16 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'double side extension'.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Z5060/D/21/3273060

61 Hedingham Road, Dagenham, London, RM8 2NA

- 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 Mohammed Iqbal Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
- The application Ref 21/00131/HSE, dated 22 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2021.
- The development proposed is described as a 'double storey side extension, relocation of front porch, resubmission'.

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension and relocation of front porch at 61 Hedingham Road, Dagenham, London, RM8 2NA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00131/HSE, dated 22 January 2021, subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 002A, 004A, 006A.
 - 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.

Reasons

3. The main issue in these appeals is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The development plan includes

policies CP2 and CP3 in the Council's Core Strategy (2010) (CS) and BP2, BP8 and BP11 in its Borough Wide Development Plan Policies DPD (2011). It also includes policy D4 in the Published London Plan 2021 (LP) which is unchanged from the Intend to Publish version referred to in the Council's decision and has replaced the policies in the 2016 London Plan referred to in its decision. Together these seek to ensure that development delivers high-quality design that respects the local context and preserves or enhances non-designated heritage assets.

4. The appeal site lies within the Becontree Estate, a non-designated heritage asset referred to in the Council's policies and designated as an Area of Townscape Value. The estate has historic significance having been built as 'Homes fit for Heroes' in the interwar period and at the time was the largest public housing estate in the world. Whilst there have been some changes, its architectural significance lies in its cottage estate design which remains evident with symmetrical arrangements of mainly hipped roof semi-detached and terraced houses set behind front gardens and often privet hedges, resulting in a balanced and uniform street scene. Corner plots are generally wide and open, contributing positively to the character of the estate and the attractive openness of junctions.
5. The appeal dwelling is an end of terrace property in a corner position. It has already been altered by a hip to gable roof alteration, a loft conversion and a large rear dormer, resulting in an unduly prominent gable end which has a part pitched, part flat roof and a top-heavy appearance. Those alterations detract significantly from the character of the terrace and the area.
6. Both proposals would extend the dwelling to the side and an existing side porch would be removed and a new porch would be added to the front elevation. The proposal in Appeal A has a larger footprint and a double pitched roof. The proposal in Appeal B is smaller and has a hipped roof.
7. The pitched roof design of the scheme in Appeal A would not reflect the predominantly hipped roofs of the surrounding dwellings and its substantial scale and bulk would unacceptably reduce the openness of the corner plot.
8. Whilst the proposal in Appeal B would still represent a large increase in the size of the dwelling and there would be some loss of openness of the corner plot, its hipped roof would reflect the form of the surrounding roofs appropriately and its reduced size and scale would allow a reasonable degree of openness on the corner to remain. Furthermore, it would replace the existing flat roof and would partially obscure the loft conversion. The proposed alterations in this scheme would greatly improve the appearance of both the side and front elevations of the property.
9. I conclude, therefore, that whilst the proposal in Appeal A would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area and would be contrary to the development plan policies referred to above, the proposal in Appeal B is acceptable, would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area and would accord with those policies.
10. In regard to Appeal B only, in addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in order to provide certainty. A

condition requiring matching external materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons stated above, I conclude Appeal A should be dismissed and Appeal B should be allowed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector