



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2025

by **C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/25/3365297

47 Bell Farm Avenue, Dagenham RM10 7AT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms RR Olatunji against the decision of the Council of The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref. is 25/00061/HSE.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of two storey side extension and two storey part single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey, end-terrace dwelling with off-street parking on a driveway to the front. It is located on Bell Farm Avenue in a largely residential neighbourhood. Whilst many local houses are of similar scale and height, there is no prevailing architectural style to properties in the immediate street scene, which is characterised by buildings of differing design, detailing and external materials.
4. Amongst other things, the property has been previously extended with a large rear dormer window at roof level, and a scheme for a two-storey side and single storey rear extension has also been implemented (Council reference 21/01301/HSE). Upon full completion, these elements would add substantially to the mass of the original dwelling and alter its appearance.
5. The appeal scheme proposes further development in the form of ground and first floor rear extensions. These would be clearly visible from the back gardens of surrounding houses and from the footpath running along the west boundary. The ground floor section would be larger and higher than the 2021 approval, whilst the first floor element would include a shallow, dual-pitched roof that would adjoin part of the existing rear dormer window.
6. To my mind the extensions would fail to harmonise with the other additions to the property; the proposed arrangement would appear jarring, overwhelming the

current building with projections to the rear at ground and first floor level of varying depth and style, together with a mixture of roof forms and window shapes and sizes. There is also a substantial outbuilding in the garden which further adds to built form within the rear amenity space and in conjunction with the scheme would exacerbate the overdeveloped nature of the site. Cumulatively the resultant dwelling would lack architectural subtlety, resulting in an obtrusive appearance within the context of the house, its back garden and the surrounds⁷. I appreciate that the application site is not designated within a Conservation Area, nor an Area of Special Local Character, and does not contain any Listed Buildings. Moreover, there are no concerns in relation to neighbouring amenity and the side extension is generally consistent with that previously permitted. However, these points do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

8. I therefore conclude that the scheme would result in detriment to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. It would contravene Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD5 of the Barking and Dagenham Local Plan 2020-2037, Policy D4 of the London Plan and the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012), which collectively expect new development to be of a high-quality design that reflects and respects the existing setting and local context. It would also be inconsistent with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to the above and all other issues before me, the appeal fails.

C Hall

INSPECTOR