
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/25/3365032
420 Goresbrook Road, Dagenham RM9 4UX

- 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 Mohamed Bharadia against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application ref. is 25/00312/FULL.
 - The development proposed is construction of a two storey side extension and a single storey front extension to create a new 1 bed, 2 person dwelling with associated cycle and refuse stores, and a front porch to the host dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for a full award of costs was made by Mr Mohamed Bharadia against the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal form has been completed using the description of development on the decision notice, which differs from that on the application form. I have taken this as agreement to the amended description and decided the appeal on that basis.
4. The Council states that the reasons for refusal relate to design, car parking and biodiversity net gain. However, the decision notice only refers to aspects of design and, accordingly, the aspects referred to form the main issues.

Main Issues

5. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - character and appearance of the area and
 - living conditions of the neighbouring occupier of 418 Goresbrook Road, with particular regard to overbearing and overshadowing.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The site is a wedge-shaped corner plot containing the two-storey end house of a terrace of four, set back from a tree-lined street, across which there is a large park.

- The main door is in the end wall. The unattached neighbouring house is set at right angles in a diagonally mirrored plot and forms the end of one of three terraces around a pedestrian *cul-de-sac* (known locally as a “banjo” due to its plan form).
7. This layout is characteristic of the wider Becontree Estate, albeit details, such as the presence or shape of green space near the street access, or the triangular or square shape of corner plots vary. The Council states that the Estate is a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA), summarises its significance and quotes from one of five appeal decisions in which it was found to be an NDHA.
 8. The appellant disagrees, supplying appeal decisions that found otherwise. I have neither the full decisions cited by the Council, nor the evidence that led to them. All but one¹ of those supplied by the appellant pre-date the adoption of the Barking and Dagenham Local Plan (BDLP) in September 2024 and, again, I do not have the evidence that led to them before me.
 9. Policy SPP6 of the BDLP refers to the Becontree Estate. Its justification states that a Design Code is under development to help preserve it as an NDHA; however, that Code is not before me. Whilst I have had regard to the evidence on the historic importance of the Estate, I am also mindful of the Planning Practice Guidance.² I do not have a copy of a local list entry or a policy stating that it is an NDHA. Therefore, for the purposes of this appeal, I do not consider it one.
 10. The proposal is to extend the terrace to create a further dwelling, the rear corner of which would be built to and clipped at the boundary with the unattached neighbour. A new roof hip would be formed, chamfered at the rear corner. A single storey front element with monopitch roof would contain the door and ground floor windows to the new dwelling and a relocated door to the existing house. The side and part of the front gardens would be allocated to the new dwelling.
 11. The effect would be to restrict the view of the neighbouring terrace and “banjo” from the street, reducing spaciousness and eroding the rhythm of a recurring pattern in the area. Despite a nearby example on the same street (no. 452) and others in the wider Estate, angled walls and chamfered roof hips are not generally characteristic of the area and it would, in my view, appear unusual. Whilst more common, the front extension would also detract from the simplicity of the original.
 12. I have had regard to the many application and appeal decisions supplied by the appellant and accept that permission has been granted on corner plots in the area for front and side extensions in the past. However, most do not have angled walls and chamfered roofs. Of those that do, few are as wide or fill the plot to the boundary. In some cases, existing extensions across a street or “banjo” meant that symmetry had already been compromised or would be restored by the proposal.
 13. More generally, many of these decisions pre-date the adoption of the BDLP. Whilst I have no copies of the superseded policies to compare, the justification for Policy SPP6 clearly anticipates Becontree Estate seeing the least development, to protect its character. This recognises both the need to develop small sites and the limited remaining opportunities to do so on the Estate without losing the spaciousness that forms one of its original and largely remaining characteristics.

¹ APP/Z5060/W/24/3345112

² Ref. ID: 18a-040-20190723

14. I have also had regard to the previous permission and certificate of lawfulness at the appeal site. I do not have sufficient details of the permission or the policy on which it was determined, with which to compare the appeal proposal. In any event, the permission is no longer extant, and policy has changed since it was granted. I accept that hip-to-gable and dormer extensions could be implemented, but do not consider that these would be as harmful as the appeal proposal.
15. Overall, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies D4 of the London Plan (March 2021) and Policies SP2, SPP6, and DMD1 of the BDLP. These policies seek to deliver good design, to ensure developments relate to their context, integrate with the existing character of the Becontree Estate and enable the preservation of its historic fabric.
16. As I have found that the Estate is not an NDHA for the purposes of this appeal, Policy HC1 of the London Plan and Policy DMD4 of the BDLP are not engaged.

Living conditions

17. The proposal would extend the full height and depth of the terrace by about 4.5m, so that, viewed from the street, it would overlap the side of 418 Goresbrook Road. It would also construct a blank two-storey wall along about 2.5m of the boundary, about 3m from the main door of no. 418.
18. The impact on the rear garden of no. 418 would be to reduce daylight and sunlight to the part nearest both houses, albeit the proposed roof slope would still admit summer sun to the larger part. It would also reduce outlook from the rear garden from where sight of the open street and its trees would be lost. The impact on the side garden would be to introduce mass at the boundary.
19. I am aware that a similar extension on the same street at no. 452 was permitted in 2007. I do not have all the details on which the Council based that decision, but the drawings show that extension set in from the boundary behind a passageway of about 800mm width. In this case, there would be no such offset and, together with the effects on outlook and natural light, on which I have no technical evidence, this would make the proposal unacceptably oppressive.
20. Therefore, it would fail to provide adequate living conditions for the occupiers of 418 Goresbrook Road, contrary to Policies D4 and D6 of the London Plan and Policies SP2 and DMD1 of the BDLP, which require, amongst other things, design analysis to ensure sufficient daylight and sunlight, and all development proposals to consider the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

21. The appeal site could be considered a small site in terms of the Mayor's Small Site Design Codes London Plan Guidance (June 2023), however, in my view, it is not a good example of the type of sites to which it refers. Within the street-facing context, for example, it does not form a gap or comprise the completion of a corner. It also has very low public transport accessibility, so densification is not a priority.
22. Despite this, the benefits of a dwelling would make a small difference to the overall housing supply and assist in meeting the strategic target for provision on small sites, which the Council has not met and seems unlikely to soon. The Council's efforts in respect of sites under a hectare mitigate but do not obviate its failure to comply with Policy D2 of the London Plan in this respect.

Planning Balance

23. The 2023 Housing Delivery Test result for the Borough was 66% and it is common ground that, whilst improving, housing delivery remains substantially below the requirement. In these circumstances footnote 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) establishes that the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date.
24. Consequently, permission should be granted unless adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole. The site is not within a protected area, but the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole.
25. Specifically, paragraph 135 of the Framework requires development to function well, add to the overall quality of the area, to be sympathetic to local character and to create places with a high standard of amenity for existing users. I have found harm in respect of the effects on character and appearance and on living conditions, to which I attach significant weight.
26. Set against this, the under-delivery of housing overall and on small sites specifically is an important matter. The proposal would address these, but only in a small way. The modest weight I therefore attach to these benefits, is significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the harm I have identified. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

27. For the above reasons and having had regard to all other matters including the Framework, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR