



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2023

by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/23/3322015

95 Ellerton Road, Dagenham, Barking and Dagenham RM9 4HR

- 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 Abul Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 23/00030/HSE, dated 5 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the Becontree Estate as a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

3. The Becontree Estate is a non-designated heritage asset referred to in the Council's policies and defined 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. The area's townscape significance lies in its cottage estate design, which despite some variation in built form, remains evident with symmetrical arrangements of semi-detached and terraced houses in a uniform rhythm.
4. The appeal property is a two-storey end terrace house with a single storey addition that extends to the side boundary. The neighbouring property No 93 addresses the junction of Ellerton Road and Stamford Road with a first-floor gap, characteristic of the area, between the properties.
5. The proposed first floor side extension would sit above the existing single storey extension and would provide an additional bedroom without compromising on garden space. The proposal would utilise matching materials and would not harm the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. It would be set back from the front elevation and down from the ridge line and would appear subservient to the host property.
6. However, it would fully extend to the side boundary and would close the existing gap between No 93 and the appeal property. The proposal would have a terracing effect, visually joining Nos 93 and 95, significantly harming the

symmetry and rhythm of the street scene and hence the significance of the Becontree Estate as a non-designated heritage asset.

7. My attention has been drawn to a number of other developments in the area. However, I note that elements of their design differ from the appeal proposal, namely the separation distances and relationship to adjacent properties. Consequently, the context would differ significantly to that of the scheme before me, and so they do not lead me to a different view in this case.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the Becontree Estate as a non-designated heritage asset. It would conflict with Policies D1, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (March 2021), Policies CP2 and CP3 of the Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy (July 2010) and Policies BP2 and BP11 of the Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011). Amongst other matters these policies seek to ensure development recognises local character and promotes good design whilst protecting and enhancing historic environments.
9. There would also be conflict with the aims of the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework that outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

K Allen

INSPECTOR