



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2025

by A Phillips MPlan BA CertHE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/25/3362324

88A Standfield Road, Dagenham RM10 8JT

- 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 Golam Mamun against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 24/01572/FULL.
 - The development proposed is described as: loft conversion with hip to gable for 1st floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. It is noted that the only conflict between the appellant and the Council is the hip-to-gable element of the proposal, which forms the main issue as detailed below.
3. Following submission of the appeal, the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024 and updated on 7 February 2025. The parts of the Framework most relevant to the appeal have not substantively changed from the previous version.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance to the local area that also forms part of a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

5. The appeal site forms the end part of a terrace block, set back from the road behind a small area of landscaped open space. Both end terrace properties have hipped roofs and are very similar in appearance. On Standfield Road there is a mix of terraces and semi-detached dwellings, with hipped roofs being a dominant design feature. There are a few examples in the local area of alternative roof styles, though these do not define the character and appearance of Standfield Road. It is noted that 66 Standfield Road has a similar development approved and while this weighs in favour of the proposal, it is an exception to the prevailing character and appearance of this street scene.
6. The proposed development would fail to preserve the roof style of existing property or the overall roofscape of the local area. It also would not create an enhancement to the existing property, the terrace block or the wider street scene. The proposal, therefore, by virtue of its hip-to-gable element would cause the unbalancing of the terrace block, does not following the architectural cues of the host property and

would erode the character and appearance of the area that is heavily defined by its roofscape.

7. The Council has noted that the wider area known as Becontree Estate is a non-designated heritage asset built as part of the Homes for Heroes following the First World War and on this basis the proposal also needs to be considered as it contributes to this heritage asset, in accordance with paragraph 216 of the Framework, which requires a balanced judgement. While not mentioned in the decision notice, the Council refers to Policy SPP6 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Local Plan 2024 (Local Plan) in the officer report. The appellant has provided comments on the Becontree Estate in their appeal statement. Whilst the harm would be very limited to the asset as a whole; nevertheless, it would erode the overall character and appearance of the wider estate. On this basis the proposal does not comply with Policy SPP6, which states all development in Becontree Estate must integrate with the existing character.
8. To conclude the proposal would not comply with Policy D4 of the London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London 2021, which seeks to ensure overall good design. In addition, the proposal would fail to comply with Policies SP2 and DMD5 of the Local Plan, which seeks to ensure extensions take into account existing roofscape of the area and host dwelling, overall sympathetic to the original dwelling and ensure high quality design that responds to local character. The proposal would also fail to comply with the guidance within the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2012, which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to the existing dwelling and details the importance of the roofscape that forms a significant part of an areas character. The National Planning Policy Framework supports these policies and SPD by the requirement for high quality design with clear guidance on design expectations.

Other Matters

9. The proposal would help to improve the accommodation of No.88a through the creation of an additional en-suite bedroom. However, this improvement to the housing stock does not overcome the harm to the character and appearance of the area as detailed above.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and the other material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is dismissed.

A Phillips

INSPECTOR