



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/24/3339293
53 Treswell Road, Dagenham, RM9 6XL.

- 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 K Rahman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 23/01903/HSE.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and single storey front and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side and single storey front and rear extension at 53 Treswell Road, Dagenham, RM9 6XL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/01903/HSE, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: A23-112-01.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issue to be:
 - a) the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host property, the terrace of which it is part, the street scene and thereby the character and appearance of the wider Becontree Estate, a non-designated heritage asset; and,
 - b) the impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of 51 Treswell Road in terms of its potential to appear overbearing.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property, 53 Treswell Road (No 53) is a two-storey end of terrace house. It is located on the Becontree Estate, which is a non-designated heritage asset. I consider that the significance of this non-designated heritage asset is the

- design and layout of the estate, including the areas of green space, together with the architectural form and style of the properties.
4. The properties within this part of the estate are characterised by two-storey pitched roofed houses in short terraces. The last house in each terrace has a hipped roof.
 5. No 53 is built on a 90-degree bend on Treswell Road. The next terrace is positioned at right angles to No 53. Both Nos 51, the first house in the neighbouring terrace, and No 53 are set back from the corner behind a small area of green open space. The boundary between Nos 51 and 53 runs at 45 degrees between the rear of the two dwellings.
 6. As I saw a number of houses in this terrace have been extended and altered by the construction of, along with other things, quite large front extensions. In addition, two-storey side extensions to the last house in a terrace, which have altered the roof line and extended the terrace, are not an uncommon feature locally, including the neighbouring dwelling No 51.
 7. The appellant proposes a part single, part two-storey wrap around extension to the front and side of the property and a single storey rear addition.
 8. While maintaining the eaves line of the host property the ridge of the two-storey extension would be set down below that of the main house. The two-storey element would also be set back behind the main façade of No 53 by about a 1.0 metre. The pitch of the mono-pitched roofs of the front and rear additions would match that of the main roof. Therefore, in my judgement the proposed extensions, despite the overall floor area created would appear as a well-mannered subservient addition to the dwelling and indeed the terrace given the corner location of No 53.
 9. Furthermore, the proposed design would maintain the characteristic hipped roof form of the development here, and to all but the most casual of observers the form and style of the original terrace would remain clearly defined.
 10. The Council's Residential Extension and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) (SPD) is a material consideration, but it is only guidance, and it should not be applied to each and every property prescriptively to the exclusion of all other factors, including the physical circumstances and context of a site. The SPD says, amongst other things, that in respect of terrace houses, the extension should be designed so that the front elevation is parallel with the front elevation of the existing house.
 11. Due to the set back of the proposed first floor addition, the continuity of the street elevation of the terrace at first floor level the extension would to some limited extent be broken. However, this set back would reinforce the subservience of the two-storey side extension and makes for a more visually interesting end to the terrace here.
 12. I appreciate that the side extension would bring the property closer to its side boundary. However, given the area of green open space on the corner to the side of the property and the scale and form of the side extension I am not persuaded that the house as extended would sit uncomfortably on its plot or serve to diminish to any significant extent the visual 'berating space' between the terraces identified by the Council.
 13. The proposed extensions would alter the appearance of No 53 and the terrace of which it is part. Nevertheless, in my opinion, the proposed development would be

of a well-conceived design that would not, in this case, cause harm or loss of the significance of the Becontree Estate identified as non-designated heritage asset.

14. Consequently, the proposed development would accord with the objectives of The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework), Policies D1, D6 and HC1 of the London Plan, Policies CP2, CP3 and CR2 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (July 2010) (CS), Policies BP2 and BP11 of the Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Plan Document (March 2011) (DPD), the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Residential Extension and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) (SPD), Policies SP2, DMD1, DMD4 and DMD6 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Local Plan 2037 (DLP) as they, amongst other things, address the quality of development, protect non-designated heritage assets, and protect and enhance the character and amenity of the area .

Living conditions

15. No 51 is an end of terrace property. It has been extended by virtue of a single storey light weight carport/garage structure.
16. Given the relationship of No 53 to No 51, the built-up suburban character of the area, the modest size and siting of the proposed rear addition and the proposed location of the two-storey extension in relation to No 51 I do not consider that the proposed addition here would have a materially harmful overbearing impact on the occupiers of No 51.
17. The development would therefore accord with the aims of the Framework, Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan, CS Policy CP3, DPD Policy BP8, DLP Policies DMD1 and DMD6 and the SPD as they seek to protect residential living conditions.

Conditions

18. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building.
19. In the interests of certainty, I shall however impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR