



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/21/3283188

17 Campsey Road, Dagenham RM9 4DS

- 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 Chibuike Oji against the decision of London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01306/HSE, dated 10 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 01 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'Construction of a two storey side extension including a side entrance with canopy roof'.
-

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. 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. Within this pattern and grain, gaps within the streetscene provide some relief from built form. Larger plots at junctions make the main contribution in this respect, as does the occasional smaller mid-road gap between terraces and semi-detached pairs.

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. The host terrace fronts Campsey Road and the appeal site is situated on a corner plot with Campsey Gardens, a cul-de-sac.
7. The appeal scheme would introduce a two storey side extension. The extension would have a modest set-back from the front elevation and would be modestly set-down from the roofline. However, from the rear elevation there would be no set-back. The extension would be of a similar width to the host dwelling and would therefore almost double the width of the host dwelling. The overall size and design of the proposal would dominate the host dwelling and unbalance the host terrace. Moreover, it would be prominent within the street scene of both Campsey Road and Campsey Gardens; the massing and scale of the rear elevation of the extension would be particularly stark in the latter streetscene. The proposal would also infill a gap which provides relief in the tight grain of the Estate and create a secondary frontage, which would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the streetscene and regular Estate pattern which contributes to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.
8. Whilst there are other examples of side extensions within the Becontree Estate, I have considered the appeal scheme on its own merits within its specific circumstances and built context.
9. 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

10. 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