
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2024

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/23/3327319
3 Spinney Gardens, Dagenham RM9 5DR

- 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 Syful Islam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 23/00704/HSE, dated 10 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey front and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. While the appellant has described the proposal as in the above heading, the Council has referred to it as a single storey front, side and rear extension. From my inspection of the plans, the Council's description more fully reflects the development sought. I have assessed the proposal on that basis.
3. The Council has referred to various policies of The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Draft Local Plan 2037 (Submission Version). As this plan remains in draft form, its policies may change prior to adoption. Accordingly, I attach limited weight to this emerging plan.
4. Since the appeal was lodged, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. The Framework does not raise any new matters that are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.

Main issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a 2-storey end terrace dwelling that occupies a prominent corner plot within a residential cul-de-sac along which some properties have been extended and externally altered. No 3 is not a listed building nor is it within a conservation area. It is, however, within the Becontree Estate, which is an interwar public housing development that was the largest of its kind in the world. Due to its historical and social significance, the Estate is a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). In weighing applications that affect NDHAs, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)

states that a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

7. The proposal is to enlarge No 3 with an L shaped ground floor extension that would wrap around 2 sides of the host building and extend beyond its rear elevation. It would widen and elongate the built form of the main house, significantly enlarge its footprint, and noticeably add to its scale and mass. Given the modest proportions of the host building, the appeal scheme would be disproportionate addition. That the new roof form would include a flat section and a pitched element set at a different angle to that of the main hipped end roof would exacerbate the lack of unity and cohesion with the host dwelling. The main outcome would be an unsympathetic and obtrusive addition to the existing building, the terrace and the local street scene.
8. By introducing new built form into the side and rear garden of No 3, the proposal would also erode the space between the house and the road. I saw that a similar form of development has taken place as a ground floor extension to 30 Spinney Gardens, which stands on the opposite side of the highway to the site. In my view, the extension to No 30 has significantly diminished the open character of the local street scene to which No 3 also belongs.
9. The proposal might in one sense re-establish a more symmetrical and balanced arrangement to the properties on either side of the road. However, it would further narrow the entrance to the turning head of the cul-de-sac and impair the open character to this part of the street scene even more. In other words, it would compound the harm already caused by the extension to No 30, that would be to the detriment of the area's character and appearance. By further eroding the deliberate spatial and visual relationship between nearby properties and the road that appears to be part of their original design, the appeal scheme would diminish the significance of the Becontree Estate as a NDHA.
10. The other developments identified by the appellant differ from the proposal in their scale, design and in their relationship to the host building and the street scene. As the context of these cases differs to that of the appeal scheme they do not lead me to a different view in this instance.
11. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Extensions and Alterations* (SPD) sets out guidelines for development on corner plots. It states that an extension that compromises the openness of such a plot could have a detrimental impact on the street scene. For the reasons given, that would be the case with the proposal before me.
12. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would materially harm the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policy D4 of The London Plan, Policies CP2 and CP3 of the Council's Planning for the future of Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy and Policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of its Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document. These policies aim to ensure that development recognises local character and promotes good design whilst protecting and enhancing historic environments. It is also at odds with the Framework, which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character and adds to the overall quality of the area.
13. Once complete, the proposal would provide additional living accommodation for the appellant. A good-sized garden would remain with the new built form in place. The living conditions of others would not be affected by the appeal

scheme. Efficient use would also be made of the space available within the site. However, none of these considerations outweigh the identified harm.

Conclusion

14. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
15. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR