



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2021

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/21/3279786

38 Fanshawe Crescent, Dagenham RM9 5ES

- 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 Minhai Claudiu Virlan against the decision of London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00906/HSE, dated 17 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'Roof alteration from hip to gable end for the proposed side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development was amended following submission of the application; I have utilised the amended description.

Main Issues

3. The main issue for this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, host terrace and surrounding area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is an end of terrace dwelling situated within the predominantly residential Becontree Estate in Dagenham. The Becontree Estate is not subject to any landscape or heritage designations. It is an extensive area predominantly built between 1921 to 1934 as part of the Homes for Heroes initiative following the First World War, though the area has experienced some change and it incorporates some modern development. The Council considers the Becontree Estate to be a non-designated heritage asset, with a degree of historic significance which arises from the retained authenticity of the area in relation to its spaciousness, regularity of pattern of built form and homogeneity of design. The character of the Becontree Estate varies across its extensive area, though the matching type and simple architectural design of its terraces and dwellings, and the pattern and grain of built development within the Estate create a sense of uniformity.
5. The terrace within which the appeal site is located ('host terrace') is a typical example of one of the few variations of terrace types in the Becontree Estate

and therefore, it contributes to the sense of uniformity of the area. Notably shallow hipped roofs are the predominant roof form of such terraces and are characteristic of the Estate. The host terrace is orientated towards Fanshawe Road at a bend in the road. Due to the layout and orientation of the host terrace and adjacent buildings, the host terrace is not prominent within the southerly part of the streetscene.

6. The appeal site benefits from planning permission (Council ref. 20/01765/HSE) for a two-storey side extension. The current appeal scheme seeks to amend the approved hipped roof form of that extension to a gable end. At the time of my visit, construction works for the side extension were well underway, however, the roof had not yet been constructed. The host terrace otherwise retains its original shallow hipped roof form. The proposed gable end would be clearly visible in the streetscene, despite the siting and orientation of surrounding buildings. The proposed gable end would not match the roof type at the opposite end of the host terrace and would unbalance it. Further, it would appear incongruous with the wider area which, with some limited variance, is characterised by shallow hipped roofs.
7. In considering this scheme which affects a non-designated heritage asset, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
8. The proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the dwelling, host terrace and the area. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to policy D4 of the London Plan (LP 2021), adopted 2021, policies CP2 and CP3 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (CS), adopted 2010, and policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Plan Policies DPD (BWDP), adopted 2011. These policies seek, amongst other things, development of a good design which appreciates the character of its surroundings and conserves or enhances the significance of the historic environment.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons stated above, I find that the appeal proposal is contrary to the relevant policies of the Development Plan and would cause harm to the significance of a non-designated heritage asset. This harm is not outweighed by any benefits arising from the proposed development. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR