



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: 06 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/21/3276135
520 Gale Street, Dagenham RM9 4UR

- 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 Alfred Dajci against the decision of London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00669/HSE, dated 14 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'Relocation of front entrance door to the front including a canopy'.
-

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 London Plan 2021 (LP 2021) was published on 1 March 2021 and is now part of the Development Plan. The Council's decision notice referred to the previous London Plan, despite its date of 26 May 2021. I am satisfied that the equivalent policies in the new plan have broadly the same approach as their counterparts, and they do 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.
6. 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. 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.

7. The appeal scheme proposes to insert a new primary entry door for the dwelling into its front elevation. Whilst the host terrace features primary entry doors within the front elevation, these are generally recessed under an arch. The end of terrace properties within the host terrace are accessed by a door to the side. This is reflective of other terraces of this type within the Becontree Estate. However, there is a strong prevalence of front elevation primary entries on other building types in the immediate vicinity of the site, and a few scattered examples of front elevation primary entrance doors in terraces of the same type as the host terrace.
8. The appeal scheme would erode an original design feature of the terrace to a minimal degree, within the context of such alteration and change being prevalent in the wider area. This would erode the uniformity of the area and cause very limited, less than substantial harm to the character of the Becontree Estate. 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. Despite the minimal nature of the harm, no benefits have been identified as arising from the scheme which would outweigh that harm.
9. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to policy D4 of the LP 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.

Conclusion

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