



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2026

by Robert Naylor BSc (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/C/24/3341191

247 Downing Road, Dagenham RM9 6LU

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the 1990 Act) as amended.
- The appeal is made by Mr Nanu Miah against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
- The notice was issued on 14 March 2024.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is *without planning permission, the unauthorised erection of a porch at the front of the property*.
- The requirements of the notice are:
 - Remove the unauthorised porch in its entirety.*
 - Remove all subsequent waste material from the premises.*
- The period for compliance with the requirements is *6 months*
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (f) and (g) of the 1990 Act (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended).

Formal Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and the enforcement notice is quashed, and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended) for the development already carried out, namely the erection of a porch at the front of the property at 247 Downing Road, Dagenham RM9 6LU.

Appeal under ground (a), the deemed planning application

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is part of a terrace of properties located on Downing Road in Dagenham. The area is residential in character despite being located in close proximity to Dagenham Heathway station and a commercial area along Heathway. The houses have a traditional suburban appearance, although the properties on either side of Downing Road differ in terms of their design and materiality. The terrace houses along the northern side of the road have been altered over time by the provision of replacement windows, and erection of extensions which include front porch additions.
4. The appeal site provides a single storey rendered porch, which the Council maintain is of a scale and height which dominates the front elevation of the host property to its detriment and that of the wider street scene.

5. During my site observations, I noted several porch additions to properties on Downing Road which include, decorative canopies over front doors, porches with flat and pitched roofs and several properties that exhibited large extensions to the front that encompassed the entrance and the windows at the ground floor level. In this context, the appearance of the enclosed porch does not appear out of keeping given the prevalence of other examples along the road.
6. As the addition is single storey only, the porch has a proportion and scale that is subordinate with the host property. Furthermore, it retains a similar building line with the large extension at the adjoining property (249 Downing Road). Indeed, the porch subject to this appeal is significantly smaller and less conspicuous than the extension at No. 249, thus in my view does not dominate the front elevation of the host property or the street scene, thus the integrity of the building is retained.
7. Consequently, the general lack of uniformity, ensures the front porch at the appeal site does not appear discordant within the street scene, allowing the development to integrate effectively within the wider area, as its scale, height and materials are not unique.
8. For these reasons, the development preserves the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It is therefore consistent with the relevant sections of policies BP8 and BP11 of the Planning for the future of Barking and Dagenham: Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document, adopted March 2011, which seeks, amongst other things, to deliver good design which has regard to the local character of the area and help to create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place. The development is also consistent with the overarching design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, insofar as it seeks a high quality of design.

Other Matters

9. Third party representations refer to the proximity of the porch to the adjoining extension, and their inability to undertake damp proofing to the external wall and use of a shared gutter. These are not matters generally dealt with under the planning regime and are more relevant to Building Regulation requirements and/or civil matters. Thus, as appropriate control would be provided under other legislation, these are not matters for my consideration.

Conditions

10. Given that the proposal is retrospective and is acceptable in terms of design and materiality, there is no need to attach the standard time limit, approved plans or a materials condition.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed on ground (a) and planning permission will be granted. The appeals on grounds (f) and (g) do not therefore need to be considered.

Robert Naylor

INSPECTOR