



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2025

by **H Whitfield BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/25/3369338

2 Parsloes Avenue, Dagenham, Barking and Dagenham RM9 5NX

- 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 V Vornicescu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 24/01733/FULL.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage and the construction of a new two storey, 2(3p) bedroom dwellinghouse on land adjacent 2 Parsloes Avenue.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area including the Becontree Estate;
 - the effect of the proposed development on highway safety; and
 - whether the proposed parking provision would be acceptable.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is an end-terrace dwelling located on a prominent junction in a corner plot. The terrace is set back behind an area of landscaping and has a crescent shape design, with each property angled to front the respective highways. The site lies within the Becontree Estate which is an interwar public housing development that has a distinctive local character, partly due to its consistency of design and urban grain and is identified by the Council as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). The significance of the NDHA derives from its planned development for Homes for Heroes in the period 1921 to 1934 and is understood to have been the largest municipal estate in the world at the time.
4. The area is predominately characterised by two-storey terraced properties that follow linear building lines with relatively small gaps that exist between blocks, providing access to the rear. Exceptions to this are the more spacious corner plots, such as the appeal site, which are generally angled to respond to the context of the street and set back behind landscaping with greater separation distances between the adjacent terraces. This allows for views between and around buildings and provides a sense of

openness and visual relief from the otherwise relatively dense urban grain. The consistent architectural forms, layout, rhythm of the street scene and pattern of development contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. As a characteristic dwelling within a spacious corner plot, the appeal dwelling also contributes positively to the significance of the NDHA.

5. The proposed dwelling would extend the north-western side of the terrace and has been designed as a continuation of the terrace's proportions, detailing and form. This notwithstanding, the development would infill one of the larger and characteristic gaps between the adjacent linear terrace row and unbalance the crescent design of the terrace. This would reduce the characteristic sense of spaciousness and planned design of the corner plot, undermining one of the positive features of the estates design. The infilling of the gap as proposed would disrupt the rhythm of the street scene and given the dwelling would be located close to a junction, this would be prominent in the surrounding area despite the terrace's general set back position. Overall, the development would erode the consistency of the surrounding urban grain and diminish the attractive planned nature of the surrounding estate.
6. The dwellings would be provided with separate and reasonably sized rear gardens; however, this does not justify the harmful effect the scheme would have on the established pattern of the area. The incorporation of soft landscaping would also do little to mitigate the effect of the two-storey dwelling. While policies in the development plan may support infill development, this is contingent on compliance with other policies such as those that seek to preserve the character and appearance of the area and significance of heritage assets and therefore does not override the harm identified.
7. The development would replace an existing garage, and hard standing exists to the side of the appeal dwelling. However, as a low-profile, single storey and subservient form of development it is not comparable to the two-storey dwelling proposed which would add considerable bulk and massing and reduce the views between and around the buildings that are currently achievable. The existing garage, hardstanding and boundary treatments around the appeal site have little effect on the openness of the corner plot. The large gap that exists between the side elevations of the terraces and their roofscapes remains apparent in both long and short distance views in the street scene, despite the presence of these features and street trees.
8. The appellant refers to permission that has been granted for a new dwelling to the side of 275 Sheppey Road¹ within the Becontree Estate. However, this site does not relate to the same corner plot arrangement. As such, the context and arrangement of the adjacent terraces in this example are not directly comparable to this appeal scheme and do not alter my findings above.
9. As the Becontree Estate is a NDHA, in accordance with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), in determining this appeal a balanced judgement is required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss arising from the proposal and the significance of the heritage asset. This is reflected in Policy DMD4 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Local Plan 2020-2037 (the Local Plan). Given the development would undermine key features that contribute to the significance of the NDHA, the harm I have identified attracts significant weight. However, in this case, the economic, social and environmental benefits that would

¹ Council Ref. 21/02332/FULL

arise from the construction of one dwelling, which are explored in greater detail below, would not outweigh the harm identified.

10. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude the development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the Becontree Estate which is a NDHA. This is contrary to Policies SPP6, SP2, DMD1 and DMD4 of the Local Plan and Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021). Together these policies, amongst other things, seek high-quality design that contributes positively and relates to the character of the area and that new development sustains and enhances the significance of the borough's historic environment including preserving the Becontree estate as an NDHA.

Highway safety

11. The appeal site is served by an existing dropped kerb off Parsloes Avenue and is located in close proximity to a junction controlled by traffic lights. While my site visit can only represent a brief snapshot in time, I observed both the footway and road to be generally highly trafficked. The appellant states that the scheme does not propose any new vehicle crossovers. However, the plans and evidence show that a new dropped kerb would be installed to facilitate access to the parking area proposed for 2 Parsloes Avenue and the new dwelling would be served by the existing dropped kerb. This results in the creation of a new access to serve No 2.
12. The proposed plans do not show any detailed design for the site access, including any vehicular or pedestrian visibility splays or swept path analysis showing how a vehicle would manoeuvre into the parking space to the front of No 2. The development would result in the creation of an access closer to the traffic light-controlled junction. Based on the evidence before me it is unclear whether a vehicle would be able to safely manoeuvre into the proposed parking space and within the appeal site. This could result in collisions between vehicles and pedestrians to the detriment of highway safety. Therefore, in the absence of details to the contrary, the appellant has failed to demonstrate that the appeal scheme would provide safe and suitable access.
13. Reference has been made to a development approved at 275 Sheppey Road; however, the evidence indicates that this development included the use of the existing off-street parking space within the appeal site for the new dwelling and an existing off-street parking space provided within the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) for the existing dwelling. No alterations were proposed to the existing dropped kerb or crossover. As such, this example is not directly comparable to the appeal scheme and does not overcome or justify the harm I have identified. Secure cycle storage and EV charging infrastructure is also proposed which could be secured by condition; however, this is to comply with other requirements of the development plan and does not overcome the harm that could arise from the proposed development either.
14. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the appellant has failed to demonstrate that the development would not compromise highway safety. This conflicts with Policy DMT1 of the Local Plan and Policy T4 of the London Plan which together and amongst other things seek to ensure developments do not have an adverse impact on the safety of the highway network or increase road danger.

Parking provision

15. Policy T6 of the London Plan sets out that car parking should be restricted in line with levels of existing and future public transport accessibility and connectivity. It further

states that car-free development should be the starting point for all development proposals in places that are (or are planned to be) well-connected by public transport, with developments elsewhere designed to comply with the parking standards set out by Policy T6.1 and its associated table. This is further supported by Policy DMT2 of the Local Plan.

16. The evidence indicates that the site is in relatively close proximity to public transport links. I observed during my site visit that Parsloes Avenue is within a CPZ which indicates that it experiences parking pressures. I also noted that properties on Parsloes Avenue in close proximity to the appeal site had space for off-street parking to the front of the dwellings. The existing plans show two off-street parking spaces for No 2. The proposed plans show one parking space would be provided for both the new dwelling and No 2, which are both two-bedroomed properties.
17. There is dispute between the parties over what Public Transport Access Level (PTAL) zone the appeal site is located within and thus whether the development should be car-free. The evidence provided by the appellant includes an extract of the PTAL zone map which indicates the site is within PTAL 4. The Council contends the site is within PTAL 5 based on new PTAL classifications, which it states is based on statistics from 2023. However, this is not supported by any substantive evidence. No evidence has been provided which shows the appeal site within PTAL 5 or how the classifications may have changed.
18. Therefore, while I note that the site is in relatively close proximity to public transport links and the overarching aim is to avoid the dominance of private vehicles on streets, from the evidence before me it is located within PTAL zone 4 where residential developments are not required to be car-free. As such, the provision of on-site parking to serve the development or the lack of a mechanism to secure the development as car-free would not be contrary to the abovementioned policies.
19. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development is not required to be car-free, and the parking provision would be acceptable. This complies with Policies SP8, DMT1 and DMT2 of the Local Plan and Policies T1, T2, T3, T4, T6 and T6.1 of the London Plan insofar as they seek to ensure that developments comply with car parking standards to support the reduction of vehicles on London's streets.

Other Matters

20. The appellant refers to the site as previously developed land. However, as the Framework excludes land in built-up areas such as residential gardens from the definition of previously developed land, I have not treated it as such. The development is also described as a self-build scheme on the application form. However, there is no substantive evidence before me that demonstrates the development would meet the definition of a self-build home as set out in the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended). No mechanism has been provided to secure the development as self-build in any event. Therefore, I have not considered it as such.

Planning Balance

21. While I have concluded the proposed parking provision would be acceptable, I have found that the appeal scheme would result in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area including the Becontree Estate as a NDHA and that the appellant has failed to demonstrate that the development would not compromise highway safety, contrary to the abovementioned policies of the Local Plan and the London Plan. This is

sufficient to bring the development into conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. Development that conflicts with the development plan should normally be refused unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

22. The Council concedes that it has failed to satisfy the Housing Delivery Test with housing completions at 66% of its target and therefore paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is engaged. Which in this case means granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies including making an efficient use of land, securing well-designed places and ensuring safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users.
23. On the one hand, the scheme would make an effective use of land by delivering one dwelling in a location with good access to public transport, services and facilities. The development would therefore make a small but beneficial contribution to the choice of homes in the borough and its supply of housing land. As a small-site, it could be built-out reasonably quickly and social and economic benefits would arise during construction and after occupation. Additional landscaping would also provide minor biodiversity benefits. However, given the scale of the development, any social, economic or environmental benefits associated with the delivery of one dwelling would be relatively limited, even taking account of the objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing in the Framework and the Council's housing land supply position. Therefore, the weight attached to these benefits overall is limited.
24. On the other hand, the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area including the Becontree Estate as a NDHA and the appellant has failed to demonstrate that the development would not compromise highway safety. This is contrary to the Framework, which seeks high-quality design and that developments do not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Consequently, this attracts substantial weight.
25. As such, in the specific circumstances of this case, the adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework, when taken as a whole. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

26. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

H Whitfield

INSPECTOR