
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2024 by S Indermaur

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/24/3344179

97 Warrington Road, Dagenham, RM8 3JL

- 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 Arfan Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 23/01866/HSE.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey front and side extension.
-

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. Since the determination of the application, the Council have adopted a new Local Plan, the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Local Plan 2020-2037 in September 2024 (LP). The new LP has superseded the Core Strategy and the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document which were cited on the Council's decision notice. I have therefore determined the appeal with the newly adopted Local Plan in mind.
4. The description in the banner heading above has been taken from the decision notice as it more accurately and succinctly describes the development proposed.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property, the terrace row and the area known as the Becontree Estate.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is located within the Becontree Estate, which is a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). The estate is identified by the Council as an area that is locally distinctive and historically important. Whilst I do not have detailed information on its significance, at my site visit I observed that the area has terrace rows that tend to be uniform in design, size and space with bay arched openings and an area of blank façade, with a limited number of openings. I also noted that the majority of terrace blocks share a single flat building frontage, with

end of terrace properties having side facing doors, which positively contributes to a distinctive local character.

7. The appeal property itself is a two-storey dwelling situated on the end of a terrace and is located on a corner plot opposite a junction. The terrace has a distinct building line and is mostly unaltered to the front. That said, at the other end of the terrace block, there is a largely glazed front porch that sits under a veranda, which spans the entire width of the property. The host dwelling has also been altered in recent times with roof alterations (including accommodation within the roof space) as well as a rear extension.
8. The Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (REASPD) states that it is very important that a front extension reflects any existing detailing which contributes positively to its character. The proposal would introduce a large side extension which would also wrap around part of the existing property frontage.
9. In my view, the forward projecting element would unacceptably break the flat building frontage of this part of the terrace through the introduction of an uncharacteristic form of development in the Becontree Estate. The proposal would not amalgamate with the existing building line and would erode the sense of openness to the frontage. This harm is exacerbated by the positioning of the porch element of the front extension which would present an awkward relationship with the existing fenestration of the host dwelling being located partially under the existing first floor window together with the different fenestration sizes to the extension frontage. In turn, this would create a lack of symmetry to the front elevation, which would result in an unbalanced appearance.
10. Turning to the side extension element of the proposal, this would be large in width and would chamfer to the angled boundary creating a contrived design. There would be conflict with the REASPD in this respect which seeks to ensure that side extensions are sympathetically designed with regards to their form and detailing.
11. The cumulative impact of the side extension, together with the other alterations, would overwhelm the character of the original property and would appear dominant in the context of the existing dwelling. This is particularly the case given the sites location on a corner plot as it would be highly visible and dominant within the street scene. I am also conscious that the proposal would necessitate the relocation of the entrance door from the side of the dwelling to the front, which would result in the loss of an important characteristic of the Becontree Estate.
12. Taking all of these factors into consideration, the proposal would materially detract from the historic form of the building and the NDHA.
13. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of front and side extensions in the wider area, including the opposite end of the terrace to which the appeal site is attached. This property exhibits an altered design to the rest of the terrace, which creates an unbalanced appearance. However, the proposal would not demonstrate a similar design to that property and therefore would not rebalance the appearance of the terrace. Furthermore, the existing glazing and exposed veranda maintains an open feel. This is in contrast from the proposal before me, which would appear as a disjointed addition.

14. In respect of the other examples, I note many of these exhibit different designs, and the properties are located within a markedly different context. As such, these do not provide a suitable justification why an otherwise unacceptable development should be permitted. In any event, each case must be considered on its own merits.
15. The National Planning Policy Framework states that in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect NDHA's, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss to the significance of the heritage asset. In this case, there are no material considerations before me which would justify the identified harm to the estate's distinctive local character.
16. For the reasons detailed above, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the property, terrace row and the Becontree Estate. The proposal would conflict with Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD6 of the LP which together seek development that is designed in a responsive manner which respects the character of the area in which they are located and the appearance of the original house and the group of buildings of which it forms a part. In addition, the proposal would not meet Policies SPP6 and DMD4 of the LP, which together state that development proposals affecting NDHA's should enable the preservation of the historic fabric of the estate by being appropriate in terms of height, scale, form and its relationship to the surrounding context.

Other Matters

17. The appellant has also raised concerns over the processing of the planning application and the lack of engagement. Regrettable as this is, this is a matter away from the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. The proposal would conflict with the development plan read as a whole and there are no material considerations that justify granting permission. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

19. I have considered all the submitted evidence, and my representative's report, and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR