



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/25/3370012

391 Porters Avenue, Dagenham RM9 4NB

- 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 Mrs Amina Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application reference is 25/00256/HSE.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a first-floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mainly 2-storey house that occupies a prominent corner plot at the junction of Porters Avenue and Bromhall Road within a predominantly residential area. It stands at the end of a terrace of similar dwellings. At both the front and side of No 391 is a sizeable ground floor projection with a part-pitched, part-flat roof that wraps around the corner of the main house.
4. The site falls within the Becontree Estate, which is a large interwar public housing development. Due to its historical and social significance, the Estate is identified as a non-designated heritage asset. The planned layout and generally consistent design and form of the existing built form gives the Estate a homogenous appearance, which is locally distinctive.
5. The new first floor extension would be placed on top of the existing ground floor projection, with materials and a hipped roof to match the existing dwelling. It would be set back from the main front wall, with the ridge set down from that of the host building. When seen from Porters Avenue, the new addition would be noticeably behind the 2-storey house, that in turn would be behind the existing ground floor projection. This staggered arrangement, with 3 separate and visually strong front build lines, coupled with different roof profiles to one side of the dwelling, would relate uneasily to the simple design and character of the original house and other dwellings within the same terrace.
6. The proposal would also introduce an awkward detail, in which the new first-floor front window would be just above the roof of the existing ground floor projection

and immediately below the eaves. In this position, this new window would appear cramped within the front façade. It would neither line up with, nor successfully relate to, the pattern of fenestration within the existing dwelling.

7. The differing build and roof lines, and the discordant first floor front window, would combine to create a disjointed front elevation that would detract from the intrinsic character of the original dwelling and the terrace to which it belongs. That impression would be most pronounced in views from Porters Avenue just in front of the site. From this vantage point, the finished dwelling would appear incongruous, and therefore it would be an unwelcome addition to the local area. It would disrupt the broad coherence and unity that is a feature of the existing built form within the Estate and so diminish the significance of this area as a heritage asset.
8. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policies HC1 and D4 of The London Plan, and Policies SP2, DMD 1, DMD 4, DMD 5 and SPP6 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Local Plan 2020-2037. These policies aim to ensure that development recognises local character and promotes high quality design whilst protecting and enhancing heritage assets. It is also at odds with the Framework, which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character and adds to the overall quality of the area.
9. The proposal would provide additional accommodation for an elderly family member that requires special care, with a bedroom and shower room provided. I am sympathetic to this desire. However, personal circumstances rarely outweigh more general planning considerations. Once in place, the proposed extension is likely to subsist for many years to come. These considerations do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

10. Overall, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, including the absence of objections from others, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR