



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2025

by **SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/25/3362959

27 David Road, Dagenham RM8 1RH

- 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 Mohammed Bharadia against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 25/00143/HSE.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Construction of a two-storey side extension and construction of a single storey front extension including relocation of the entrance to the front'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Mohammed Bharadia against the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham. This is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the Council's description of the development proposed detailed on the decision notice, which I have used in the bullet header above, as it more accurately describes the development.
4. The Council's officer report identifies Becontree Estate (the Estate), within which the appeal site is located, as a non-designated heritage asset. This status is disputed by the appellant. I note that in a recent appeal decision concerning 44 Rugby Gardens¹, the inspector did not treat the Estate as a non-designated heritage asset. However, the evidential basis of that decision has not been submitted in the present case, and I therefore give it limited weight. By contrast, a previous appeal at the subject site², as well as a more recent appeal decision at 36 Langley Gardens³, both treated the Estate as a non-designated heritage asset.
5. The Planning Practice Guidance⁴ states information on non-designated heritage assets should be accessible to the public, clearly identified and may be recognised through both local plan making and decision-making on planning applications. The Estate is identified within Policy SPP6 of the Barking and Dagenham Local Plan

¹ APP/Z5060/W/24/3345112.

² APP/Z5060/W/24/3338837.

³ PP/Z5060/D/24/3353903.

⁴ Paragraph: 040 Reference ID: 18a-040-20190723.

(2024) (BDLP) which explicitly references its historic fabric and the supporting text to the policy refers to the preparation of a Design Code that will help to preserve the Estate as a non-designated heritage asset. On this basis, I am satisfied that the Estate meets the relevant threshold to be considered a non-designated heritage asset for the purposes of this appeal.

6. The appellant also argues that the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) is outdated, having been prepared under a previous Local Plan. However, I am satisfied that the SPD's underlying design principles remain relevant and supported by the policies within the current BDLP. As such, the SPD has been a material consideration in my assessment.

Main Issue

7. The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, with due regard to the Becontree Estate, a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

8. The appeal site contains a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot on David Road. The dwelling, and the attached 29 David Road, are of an understated design of a pleasant uniformity and symmetry, particularly prominent in public views given their location on a corner plot and facing towards Turnage Road. Both dwellings are entered via the side elevations. The side garden is relatively generous and angled, giving the plot an open, spacious character. This openness is typical of corner plots within the Estate and contributes positively to its historic form, fabric and townscape.
9. The Estate was originally built as 'Homes for Heroes' during the period from 1921 to 1934. Even allowing for alterations to buildings within the Estate, the original historic pattern, fabric and form of housing development whilst eroded is still apparent, including the spacious and open layout of corner plots, which contributes to its significance as a non-designated heritage asset.
10. The proposed development includes a two-storey side extension measuring approximately 3.3 metres in width, built flush with the existing front elevation and extending the full depth of the dwelling, with a chamfered return in response to the angled boundary. The proposed roof would follow the original dwelling's ridgeline with no set-down. In addition, a single storey front extension would expand the full width of the original front elevation with a new principal entrance.
11. Due to its scale, positioning, and lack of set-back or roof articulation, the two-storey side extension would not appear subordinate to the host dwelling. It would result in a marked reduction in the visual openness of the corner plot. The erosion of openness in this context would have a materially harmful effect on the character of the street scene and the spatial qualities and planned form of the Estate more broadly.
12. When taken together the proposed two-storey side extension and front extension would significantly unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which it forms part. This visual imbalance would be particularly apparent in views from Turnage Road, where both dwellings are prominent. I find this unbalancing effect would

cause appreciable harm to the character and appearance of the dwellings and the area.

13. The appellant has drawn my attention to a fallback scheme involving a hip to gable roof extension⁵ suggesting that scheme would cause a greater loss of symmetry to the semi-detached pair than the appeal proposal. However, that is for a very different development to that before me. Even if I accept the assertion that if implemented it would disrupt the symmetry of the pair this does not make the appeal proposal before me acceptable and which I have found also harmful for the reason set out above. The schemes are not directly comparable in scale or form.
14. The appellant has referred to numerous other schemes in the area. However, the effects of the development I have described above and the associated harm relates to the specific location of the appeal property, its positioning in its plot and the detailed design of the appeal proposal. These are not directly comparable to any of the examples quoted and thus do not weight in favour of the scheme. Indeed, the presence of other inappropriate developments reinforces the need for careful control if the remaining fabric and special character of the Estate is to be maintained. I have, in any event, determined the appeal based on its own planning merits.
15. In light of the above, I find that due to its prominent location, inappropriate design, prominent position and excessive scale, the appeal proposal when taken as a whole would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. The proposal would lead to a further erosion of the planned form of the Estate, harming the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.
16. The proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, including the Becontree Estate. As such, it would conflict with Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SPP6, SP2, DMD1, DMD4 and DMD5 of the Barking and Dagenham Local Plan (2024) which require, amongst other matters, that development promotes the character of the locality, contributes positively to the built environment and sustains the significance of non-designated heritage assets. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in respect of achieving well designed places.
17. In addition, the proposal would be contrary to the advice contained within the adopted Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which seeks to ensure that development protects and enhances the positive aspects of residential areas.

Other matters

18. I acknowledge the general support in the Framework for the efficient use of land, including previously developed land. However, in the context of this modest-scale householder application and the identified harm to local character and heritage significance, I attach limited weight in favour of the appeal proposal. However, this does not outweigh the harm identified or my finding that the proposal does not accord with the Local Plan.
19. I have had due regard to the case law and articles cited by the appellant, but these have not altered my findings on the main issue.

⁵ 24/01689/CLUP.

20. The appellant has alleged compliance with The London Plan (2021), specifically Policies GG1, GG2, D1, D3 and H10 which primarily relate to making the best use of land, the design process and delivering housing. These policies are principally strategic in nature and therefore have not been decisive in my findings.
21. The appellant has also alleged compliance with BDLP (2024) Policies SPDG1, SP3 and DMH2, which primarily relate to encouraging growth and meeting housing need. These policies are principally strategic in nature, or in the case of DMH2 has limited relevance to a householder application, and therefore have not been determinative in my decision.
22. I also note the reference to the proposed front extension being permitted under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015. Whilst this may be a fallback position for the appellant, only limited evidence to support this has been provided. The appeal before me concerns the refusal of an application for planning permission and I have determined this appeal on its individual merits.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons given above, the development conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate that the proposed development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

SJ Desai

INSPECTOR