



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: 30 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/25/3370725

41 Listowel Road, Dagenham RM10 7QL

- 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 S Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application reference is 25/00774/HSE.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part single, part double storey side extension, and part single, part double storey rear extension. Double storey side extension to be set back 1.55m from front elevation and rear extension to not exceed 3.65m. Max height of proposed single storey rear element is 3.00 metres from natural ground.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has requested that the appeal be determined with consideration given to garden plans¹ and calculations of external amenity space (EAS) that were not before the Council at the time of its decision. The Council has not therefore considered these additional drawings nor consulted others on them. This extra information provides a clearer account of the existing and proposed rear garden layout of No 41. It does so with reference to the removal of existing outbuildings, the introduction of a new shed, amongst other things, and the amount of usable private EAS that would remain if the proposal were to come forward. I am satisfied that this additional information does not significantly alter the substance of the development but rather clarifies certain matters that were previously unclear. No party would be prejudiced by my taking the garden plans and calculations into account, and I therefore have done so in reaching my decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are firstly, the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair to which it belongs and the local area; and secondly, whether the proposal makes adequate provision for private EAS for the occupiers of the appeal property.

Character and Appearance

4. Listowel Road is characterised primarily by pairs of semi-detached dwellings of similar style with generally consistent gaps at first-floor level, which positively

¹ Drawing numbers 0910 Revision A and 0911 Revision A

contribute to a rhythm and sense of space in the streetscape. While there are some minor variations in the size of these first-floor gaps, the spacing between semi-detached pairs in the vicinity of the site is broadly consistent.

5. The appeal scheme includes a first-floor side extension with a noticeably reduced ridge height compared to the main dwelling. This new addition would be set behind the front wall of a ground floor element with a flat roof. This arrangement would create a disjointed roof form with gables at 2 different levels and a flat roof that would not visually 'read' as a coherent part of the existing dwelling. It would disrupt the established rhythm of the existing built form along Listowel Road, which is distinctive feature of the street scene. By introducing new built form in an elevated position to one side of No 41, the appeal scheme would also upset the sense of balance of the pair to which it belongs given that, when seen from the road, its attached counterpart appears to largely retain its original built form.
6. Although the appellant refers to the recently approved scheme for a side and rear extension at 32 Listowel Road and to several examples of similar development elsewhere, including Bosworth Road, these cases are not the same in context to the proposal. The completed dwelling, with its awkward roof arrangement (flat and gables) and the imbalance to the host pair, would cause it to be a visually disruptive and an obtrusive addition to the local area.
7. I note that the set-back from the main front wall and matching roof pitch are deliberate design choices to ensure that the side extension is subordinate and is seen as an obvious addition. However, the significant set-back from the main front elevation, combined with the non-alignment with the existing ground-floor side projection and the introduction of multiple roof forms, results in a fragmented and visually incoherent design. This harms the architectural coherence of the host property and the pair of which it forms part.
8. The appellant also points to the presence of established trees and constrained public views that would partly screen the new development from certain locations as mitigating factors. However, these do not negate the fundamental harm caused by the proposed design and the disruptive effect on the symmetry and harmony of the street scene when viewed from other locations including the road itself.
9. On the first main issue, I conclude that the proposed first-floor side extension, both individually and cumulatively as part of the entire development, would result in a visually intrusive and incongruous addition. It would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair to which it belongs and the local area.
10. Accordingly, the appeal scheme is contrary to Policy D4 of The London Plan (TLP), Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD5 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Local Plan 2020-2037 (LP) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Extensions and Alterations (SPD). Together, these policies and guidance promote high quality design and aim to ensure that development complements the character of the local area. It is also at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which states that development should be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.

Private EAS

11. The Council's second reason for refusal refers to a lack of clarity in the submitted plans and an inability to accurately assess the extent of useable rear garden if the

new development were to be implemented. The appeal evidence includes detailed garden plans, which indicate that just over 118 square metres of useable private EAS would be left following the removal of the existing outbuildings and the introduction of a new shed. The amount of retained EAS would comfortably exceed the minimum standards set out in TLP and favourably compares with the size of the gardens of nearby properties.

12. Based on the additional information, I am satisfied that the proposal would retain a substantial and functional garden sufficient to meet the needs of the occupiers of No 41. In this respect, the appeal scheme would comply with TLP Policy D4, LP Policies SP2 and DMD1 and the Council's SPD. These policies and guidance support developments that deliver a high-quality environment and homes that include spaces that are likely to be well-used. My finding on this matter does not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the first main issue.

Other matters

13. The Council raises no objection to the new front window in the ground floor side extension that would replace a door, nor to the part single-storey, part 2-storey rear extension, in isolation. From the submitted evidence, I have no reason to reach a different view on these matters. No harm would be caused to the living conditions of others and on sustainability grounds. However, these considerations do not outweigh the identified harm.

Planning balance and conclusion

14. Overall, I have found that the development would provide adequate private EAS. However, I have also concluded that the new first-floor side extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider street scene. This harm brings the proposal into conflict with the development plan when read as a whole.
15. The benefits of the scheme, including additional living space for the appellant's family do not outweigh this identified harm. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR