



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2024 by A Khan BSc (Hons) MA

Decision by S Edwards BA MA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/23/3328826

382 and 384 Goresbrook Road, Dagenham, London RM9 4UX

- 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 Hasan Kabir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application is Ref 23/00921/FULL.
 - The development proposed is construction of a two storey side extension and new arched entrances to 382 and 384 Goresbrook Road and construction of a single storey rear extension to 384 Goresbrook Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised during the life of the appeal. The substantive elements thereof as they relate to the appeal scheme have not changed. I have not therefore sought the views of the main parties.
4. The description of development as detailed on the application form has been amended in subsequent documents. I have adopted the description included in the Council's Decision Notice, as it details the appeal proposal clearly and concisely, but have omitted the terms which are not acts of development.
5. The Council's Draft Local Plan (Draft LP) is currently under examination and is likely to be capable of being found legally compliant and sound, subject to main modifications. Most relevant to this appeal are Policies SP2, DMD1, DMD4 and DMD6 (now DMD5 as a result of the main modifications). As the Draft LP has reached an advanced stage of preparation, these policies are afforded moderate weight.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwellings and surrounding area, with particular regard to Becontree Estate, a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal properties lie in an established residential area which forms part of the Becontree Estate. Built between 1921 and 1934 as part of the post-World War One Homes for Heroes initiative, this was the largest public housing scheme ever undertaken in Britain¹, which the Council regards as a NDHA due to its historic significance. Despite some modern interventions, the area retains its distinctive layout with corner plots providing some degree of openness and visual relief from surrounding built forms. Together with the simple and cohesive architectural design which defines the properties, these elements give the area a pleasant suburban feel and sense of uniformity.
8. The appeal sites comprise end-of-terrace properties with simple hipped roofs located prominently on opposite corner plots framing the entrance to Greenfield Road and overlooking playing fields. Both sites make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Becontree Estate and its significance as a NDHA, in particular due to the largely open nature of the corner plots.
9. The proposed side extensions would appear as disproportionate additions, which would detract from the uniformity and scale of the host properties and the wider terraces they are part of. Whilst the two-storey extensions would be set one metre away from their Greenfield Road boundary, they would, due to their excessive bulk, massing and scale, reduce the size of the side gap and harmfully diminish the open character of both corner plots.
10. Furthermore, the proposed developments would also protrude significantly beyond the front building line of the houses fronting Greenfield Road and disrupt the existing alignment. This would create a sense of enclosure at the Greenfield Road junction entrance and harmfully reduce the openness of the area. Taking all this into consideration, the erosion of the corner plots would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and Becontree Estate, to the detriment of its significance as a NDHA.
11. The use of matching bricks, relocation of the front door from the side elevation to the front of the dwelling and a new arched entrance would positively contribute to the significance of Becontree Estate by maintaining a uniform façade that is in keeping with the rhythm and symmetry of the terraced block. It is also noted that the proposal would provide additional residential accommodation. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm caused by the scale and massing of the two-storey side extensions.
12. The appellant has referenced other extensions which have been constructed in the area. I do not have the full details of the circumstances which led to these particular schemes being accepted and cannot therefore be certain that they represent a direct parallel to the proposals, notably in respect of development plan policy. They have accordingly been ascribed very limited weight.
13. Given the above, the appeal scheme would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the Becontree Estate. The proposals would therefore be contrary to the design aims of Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan (July 2021), Policy CP3 of the Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy (July 2010), Policy BP11 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document

¹ Paragraph 5.2.9 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document – March 2011.

(March 2011) and Section 5.4 of the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012), as well as paragraphs 135 and 139 of the Framework.

14. The appeal scheme would also conflict with Policy HC1 of the London Plan, Policy BP2 of the DPD and paragraph 209 of the Framework, which notably seek to conserve the significance of heritage assets and preserve areas which are locally distinctive and historically important such as the Becontree Estate. For similar reasons, the proposal would not accord with Policies SP2, DMD1, DMD4 and DMD5 of the Draft LP, which also seek to secure high quality design and sustain the significance of heritage assets.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. There are no material considerations, which indicate that the appeal should be determined, other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Khan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR