
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2025

By SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/25/3364920

42 Beamway, Dagenham RM10 8XR

- 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 Saqib Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 24/01734/HSE.
 - The development proposed is erection of first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of first floor rear extension at 42 Beamway, Dagenham RM10 8XR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01734/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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations (drawing number 2001 revision B dated 12/12/2024).
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two-storey end of terrace dwelling that is located in a predominantly residential area. The surrounding street scene is characterised by a mix of semi-detached and terraced properties with varied architectural styles, resulting in no consistent or unified character.
4. The appeal dwelling occupies a prominent corner plot and presents as visually distinct from the remainder of the adjoining terrace. This is as a result of the stepped-down roofline relative to the main terrace ridgeline, an existing two-storey side extension, and a white-rendered front elevation. Additional extensions to the dwelling include a single-storey rear addition, a rear dormer, and a single-storey outbuilding.

5. The proposed first-floor rear extension would be of a modest scale and massing. It would be set down from the main roof ridge, incorporate a hipped roof design, and be set back from the rear elevation of the existing single-storey extension. Importantly, the proposal would remain subordinate to the existing roofscape and dormer and retain the existing separation between the flank elevation and the eastern boundary adjacent to the public realm. These aspects, along with the use of matching materials ensure that the extension would appear subordinate and well-integrated with the host dwelling.
6. The extension would be set behind the existing two-storey side addition and would not impact upon the front elevation of the terrace or compromise any remaining uniformity in its appearance. Given the already varied character of the street scene, the proposed development would not disrupt the visual rhythm or established pattern of development.
7. Owing to the corner plot location, the extension would be visible in public views from the south and east. However, it would be set in from the flank boundary and would not appear overbearing or visually intrusive. It would not materially result in any loss of uniformity with the wider terrace in views from the south which are dominated by the existing dormer and photovoltaic panels at an adjacent property. Instead, it would be read as part of the broader context of varied rear extensions that typify the area.
8. Whilst the dwelling has been previously extended, I do not find that the proposed extension would give rise to any harmful cumulative impact. The proposed development remains proportionate to the host dwelling.
9. I therefore find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would not conflict with Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD5 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Local Plan 2020-2037 (2024) and the overall purpose of the guidance contained within the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012). For the same reasons, the proposed development also accords with section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) relating to achieving well designed places.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests of paragraph 57 of the Framework and advice in the Planning Practice Guidance: *Use of planning conditions*. In addition to the statutory time limit condition, I agree that a condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary to provide certainty. A condition relating to materials is also reasonable and necessary in the interests of character and appearance.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the proposal would accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations which indicate planning permission should be withheld. The appeal should therefore be allowed.

SJ Desai

INSPECTOR