



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2024

**by H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 19 November 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/24/3348849**  
**63 Neasham Road, Dagenham, RM8 2LU**

- 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 Edwards Vavinskis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
  - The application Ref is 24/00629/HSE.
  - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. In September 2024, the Council adopted the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Local Plan 2020 – 2037 (LP). Draft policies SPP6, DMD1, DMD4 and DMD6 of that document were listed in the reasons for refusal. The new Local Plan was adopted after this appeal was lodged.
3. As a result of the adoption, Policies CP2, CP3 and CR2 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2010) and Policies BP2 and BP11 of the Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011) have been superseded.
4. Although the text of the draft LP policies has been modified, the policies have not changed fundamentally insofar as they relate to this appeal, although Policy DMD6 has been renumbered as Policy DMD 5 in the adopted Local Plan. The appellant commented on the previously adopted and draft policies in his appeal statement, and it has not been necessary to seek further comments on the changes.

### Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property, the semi-detached pair of which it forms part, and the surrounding Becontree Estate.

### Reasons

6. The appeal property is a semi-detached house located in a prominent corner position in the streetscene next to a cul-de-sac, or 'banjo', of houses set back from the main road. The site is within the Becontree Estate, an interwar public

- housing development that has a distinctive local character of mostly terraced and semi-detached buildings of cohesive designs. The estate is recognised as a non-designated heritage asset, to which LP Policy SPP6 applies. Amongst other criteria, this policy states that within the Becontree Estate, extensions must integrate with the existing character of the area and enable preservation and restoration of the historic fabric of the estate.
7. As a result of its corner position, the appeal property sits on a roughly triangular shaped plot, with most of its space being to the side and front of the house. This contributes to the openness in the streetscene, and is a typical arrangement for many similarly located sites throughout the Estate.
  8. The existing semi-detached pair of dwellings of which this forms part is already asymmetrical, with the appeal property having a hip-to-gable roof extension and large rear dormer window, whilst the attached property retains its original hipped roof profile, but with an attached side garage which links to a front extension. As such, the pair do not appear balanced to an extent that the proposal would disrupt its symmetry. Nevertheless, the proposal is of such scale that it would not improve the symmetry or cohesion of the pair.
  9. Rather than being integrated and harmonious, the proposal would appear disproportionately large relative to the host house, particularly when viewed from the front. Although single storey, it would appear bulky and out of keeping with the original dwelling design and form, and this would be exacerbated by its irregularly shaped footprint and flat roof. This impact would conflict with LP Policy DMD 5, which amongst other criteria requires an extension to be sympathetic and subordinate to the design of the original dwelling with regards to scale, form and detailing, as reflected in advice at paragraph 4.1.6 of the Council's 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD).
  10. Moreover, the large footprint would significantly reduce the characteristic openness which this part of the site contributes to the street scene, resulting in a more enclosed appearance to the site and the banjo. The replacement of transient open parking with a more visually intrusive extension would not enhance the setting, nor respect and complement the character of the area in which it is located as required by LP Policy DMD 5. Although not projecting forward of the front 'building line' of dwellings in the banjo, its position some distance beyond the original rear line would result in a significant intrusion on a distinctive corner plot.
  11. I note the appellant's view, but do not share the interpretation that the proposed 1m gap from the boundary with 61 Neasham Road would accord with the guidance of the SPD. Paragraph 5.4.5 of that document provides specific advice for corner plots, noting that particular care needs to be taken where the house is located at the corner of a banjo, which derive a good deal of their character from open corner spaces. It would appear that 'figure 5' of the SPD cited by the appellant relates to setbacks for a side extension from the main front wall of a house, rather than from a side boundary on a corner plot.
  12. This proposal follows the dismissal of an appeal in April 20224 under ref. APP/Z5060/D/24/3336482 for a double storey side extension and ground floor front extension. I acknowledge that this is a materially different proposal, being single storey and of lesser footprint, width and bulk than the dismissed scheme. However, at 6.8m wide compared to the stated width of 7.15m for the

dismissed scheme, I find that this proposal would also be disproportionate against the existing property. I share the previous Inspector's assessment that, due to the prominent location of the site on a corner plot, the proposal would be easily visible and would erode the open character of the streetscene and distinctive character of the area.

13. I acknowledge the appellant's view that the development supports the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) by promoting the effective use of land, as it would be situated on an underutilised part of the site. However, the Framework also states that promoting the effective use of land should safeguard and improve the environment, and I am not convinced that a development of this scale and design in this position would achieve this objective.
14. The appellant has drawn attention to extensions at 29 and 31 Neasham Road, on the opposite side of the banjo entrance. No details have been supplied of any planning permissions granted for these developments, and as such it is not known what policy framework they were assessed against. In any case, the development at No.31 is not so prominently sited in the street scene as the appeal proposal, and that at No.29 appears to be more traditionally designed. As such, they offer limited support to the appeal.
15. Whilst I appreciate that the proposal could enhance the living standards and comfort of current and future occupants of the dwelling, this would not outweigh the material visual harm that would result from an extension of the size and design proposed. It is accepted that the proposal would not result in any significant loss of garden space, although its redevelopment would displace existing open parking and a storage shed.
16. Becontree Estate is regarded as a non-designated heritage asset, and in accordance with paragraph 209 of the Framework, in assessing the appeal, a balanced judgement is required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss arising from the proposal and the significance of the heritage asset. This is reflected in LP Policy DMD 4. In this case, the benefits put forward for the proposal would not outweigh the harm outlined above. The Framework requires that applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, but in this case the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole.
17. I therefore conclude that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property, the pair of which it forms part, and the surrounding Becontree Estate. This would conflict with the overarching design and conservation aims of the Framework and Policies D1 and HC1 of The London Plan 2021 (TLP); with LP Policies SPP6, DMD 4, DMD 5 and the SPD, and the aim to secure high quality design which makes a positive contribution to the character of the surrounding area as required by LP Policy DMD 1.
18. I find no conflict with TLP Policy D8, which relates to the public realm, but that does not alter my conclusions.
19. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

*H Lock* INSPECTOR