



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/25/3369145

14 Manor Road, Dagenham, Barking and Dagenham, RM10 8AU

- 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 Reverend and Mrs Samuel Idigbe against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 25/00519/HSE.
 - The development proposed is a first storey rear extension. This project involves the complete transformation of an existing bungalow through a loft conversion and a right-side rear extension. The existing roof will be entirely removed and replaced with a new, larger roof structure designed to accommodate five new bedrooms within the loft space. This will significantly increase the living space and functionality of the property while maintaining a well-balanced external appearance. In addition to the loft conversion, the proposal includes a 2m x 4m rear extension on the right side of the building. This extension will provide additional ground-floor space, enhancing the overall layout and usability of the home. The design will be carefully planned to ensure seamless integration with the existing structure, optimizing natural light and ventilation. The new roof and extension will complement the architectural style of the bungalow, incorporating modern materials and construction techniques to improve energy efficiency and sustainability. This conversion will create a spacious and contemporary five-bedroom home, making full use of the available footprint while enhancing both practicality and aesthetic appeal.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow that has been extended to the rear. It is located in a predominantly residential area, characterised by the presence of a wide range of dwelling types, including detached and semi-detached bungalows, dormer bungalows, detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings and two and three storey blocks of flats.
4. Manor Road itself is a wide paved street and this together with the setting back of dwellings behind gardens and/or parking areas, provides for a spacious character.
5. The appeal dwelling is set back from the road behind a low brick wall, gate and large parking area. It has a garden and a large outbuilding to the rear. To one side, the dwelling is separated by a small gap to its neighbour, Number 16 Manor Road.

- To the other side of the dwelling, there is a large car park around a church building, which extends towards Rainham Road South, a wide and busy thoroughfare.
6. Consequently, the appeal site appears prominently and is very widely visible within spacious surroundings, with direct views from Rainham Road South, as well as from Manor Road itself.
 7. During my site visit, I observed that many dwellings in the area have been altered and/or extended. Many of these changes appear in character with the host dwelling and the surrounding area and the overall effect is that of a residential environment characterised by ongoing development that largely respects its surroundings.
 8. The proposed development would involve large-scale development at roof level, including six dormers. This would result in a very large increase to the overall scale and volume of the appeal dwelling's roof, resulting in the introduction of such significant additional bulk and volume as to unduly dominate the appearance of the host dwelling.
 9. Resultantly, the proposal would not appear as a subordinate addition but rather, it would overwhelm the original roof form and afford the dwelling a top-heavy appearance.
 10. Further to the above, the proposed dormer windows would be of varying shapes and sizes, resulting in an irregularity of form that would detract from the appearance of the dwelling. In addition, the placement and form of the proposed new windows would appear out of kilter with the existing fenestration and this would add to a visual effect whereby the proposed development would appear somewhat at odds with the host dwelling.
 11. Taking all of the above into account, the proposal would comprise an unsympathetic addition that would appear prominently in its surroundings.
 12. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021); to Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD5 of the Barking and Dagenham Local Plan (2024); and to the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

13. In support of their case, the appellants draw attention to other developments in the surrounding area. As above, during my site visit, I observed there to be a wide range of alterations and extensions to surrounding dwellings, including changes at roof level.
14. However, there is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that any of the examples of other developments provided are the same as and/or involve circumstances so similar to the proposal before me as to provide for direct comparison.
15. Notwithstanding this, I have found that the proposal would result in significant harm and in this case, this is not something that would be reduced or mitigated by the presence of other developments elsewhere.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR