



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2024

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/24/3341855

65 Ivyhouse Road, Dagenham, RM9 5RL.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr R. Bugelli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 23/01726/HSE.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the existing dwelling, the terrace and thereby the character and appearance of the wider Becontree Estate, identified by the Council as a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 65 Ivyhouse Road (No 65) is a two-storey end of terrace house. As is typical in the street this end of terrace property has a full hipped roof. Despite some alterations and extensions of nearby end of terrace houses the hipped roof form of the main roofs of the properties has generally been maintained unaltered.
4. I consider that the significance of Becontree Estate a non-designated heritage asset is the design and layout of the estate together with the architectural form and style of the properties, which in this immediate area have remained relatively unchanged.
5. The appellant proposes a part single part two-storey side extension, along with a hipped to gable alteration of the main roof. The proposed two-storey extension would be set back from the main façade of the property, and as a result the ridge of its gable ended roof would be marginally lower than that of the host property. However, due to the width of the extension and its relatively minor set back the proposed extension would not appear subservient.

6. The single storey addition would have a mono pitched roof that would project in front of the street elevation and over the front door to provide a cantilever weather canopy to that door.
7. The replacement of the existing hip roof with a gable would alter the dwelling's three-dimensional form so as to unbalance the roof form of the complete terrace. This would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of not only No 65 but the whole terrace. This change would serve to further denude the character and appearance of the both the street scene and the wider area.
8. The single storey extension, by reason of its design would not, in this case, be sympathetic to the design of the host property in terms of its roof form. It would therefore serve to exacerbate the harm caused by the alteration to the main roof and the two-storey addition.
9. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development as designed would appear as a discordant feature that would cause significant harm to No 65, the terrace, street scene and thereby the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, Becontree Estate. While I can appreciate the appellant's desire to extend and alter his home, I have found no public benefit to outweigh the harm that I have identified to the non-designated heritage asset.
10. The proposal would therefore not accord with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan, Policies CP2 and CP3 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (July 2010), Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Plan Document (March 2011), the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Residential Extension and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012), Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD6 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Draft Local Plan 2037 as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of development, the requirement to protect and enhance the character and amenity of the wider Becontree Estate.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has referred me to other extensions to similar properties in the Borough. Whatever the background to those cases, their existence is not an appropriate justification for permitting another here, which I have considered on its individual planning merits.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR