



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/21/3282058

65 Keppel Road, Dagenham RM9 5LU

- 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 Mrs Banima Khanom against the decision of London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01139/HSE, dated 18 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'construction of a first floor rear and 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.
3. The latest iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. The Council's decision notice referred to the previous 2019 iteration of the Framework, despite its being dated 10 August 2021. In respect of the main issues for this appeal, I am satisfied that the new iteration of the Framework has broadly the same approach as its previous iteration, and it does not alter my conclusions on the matter in any case.

Main Issues

4. 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

5. 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.

6. 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. It lies at the end of a short, pedestrianised cul-de-sac in a tucked away, corner position. It has an existing single storey, flat roof extension to the side and rear elevations. The dwelling at the opposite end of the host terrace has not been extended on its side elevation and the terrace retains its original symmetrical form.
7. The proposed extension would be clearly visible in the approach along the cul-de-sac despite its tucked away position. By reason of its siting, as well as the lack of a set back from the front elevation and a set down from the ridgeline of the roof, the proposed extension would not appear subservient to the host terrace and would unbalance its symmetry and uniformity. The Appellant's grounds of appeal refer to a proposed off-set of 0.776 metre from the side ground floor wall and 1 metre from the main front wall of the house, as well as a 0.4 metre set-down from the roofline. However, this does not reflect the proposed elevation plans before me as submitted with the appeal (ref. 210601 L 006), nor the plans linked to the application on the Council's website. In any case, such set-downs and set-back are minimal and would have little effect in mitigating the impact of the scheme.
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.

Other considerations

9. The appeal scheme is a scaled-down amendment of a previous scheme which was dismissed at appeal (ref. APP/Z5060/D/20/3260530). I have assessed the current appeal scheme on its own merits.
10. The proposed residential extension may improve the living conditions of occupiers of the property; however, this potential benefit does not outweigh the harm which I have identified above.

Conclusions

11. 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 benefits arising from the proposed development. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR