



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31/12/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/19/3244182

30 Sovereign Road, Barking, IG11 0XQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Stellson Pedro against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 19/01072/FUL, dated 22 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of ground floor and first floor side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the wider terrace and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace house. The surrounding area comprises of rows of terrace housing and semi-detached houses, some of which are linked by single storey garages.
4. The proposal is for a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. The proposed side extension would extend out to the side boundary of the site. The first floor element of the extension would be recessed from the main front elevation of the dwelling and it would also have a slightly lower ridge height such that it would appear as a subservient addition to the dwelling.
5. Advice contained within the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) (SPD) states that in respect of terrace dwellings, extensions should be designed so that the front elevation is parallel with the front elevation of the existing house. However, in this case the existing terrace is staggered, with the two end dwellings set slightly back from the main front elevation of the mid terrace dwellings. The proposed extension would introduce a further stagger at first floor level which in this instance would not appear out of character with the host dwelling or the wider terrace. Furthermore, the extensions would also be constructed in

- matching materials and would reflect the general design of the host dwelling and the terrace as a whole.
6. The existing street scene is relieved by the gaps between the buildings, which are varied in width and in some cases only exist at first floor level where dwellings are linked by single storey garages. These gaps provide visual relieve and are an important aspect of the street scene, adding to the spatial qualities of the area.
 7. The proposed two storey extension would extend to the side boundary of the site and would adjoin 28 Sovereign Road which has a single storey element to the side, with a pitched roof over. The effect of the proposed extension would be to significantly close the gap between the appeal site and 28 Sovereign Road, limiting it to the space above the relatively narrow single storey element of No 28.
 8. I acknowledge that the appellant considers the value of the existing gap is diminished as the backdrop is dominated by pylons and associated high voltage cables. Nonetheless, I find that such gaps are an important characteristic of the road and provide visual relieve and distinction to the individual terraces and semi-detached houses along Sovereign Road which would otherwise appear as a continuous built form.
 9. In significantly diminishing the gap between Nos 30 and 28 Sovereign Road, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would also be contrary to design guidance contained within the SPD which states that where it is considered that the gaps between buildings contribute positively to the character of the area, it will be expected that the first floor of proposed side extensions are set off the side boundary of the site. Whilst the SPD is for guidance purposes, it does nonetheless provide useful advice.
 10. Whilst I have found that the proposed two storey side extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the built form of the terrace, it would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area in conflict Policies BP8 and BP11 of the LDF Borough Wide Development Plan Policies DPD (March 2011). These policies collectively require development to be of a high quality design and to respect existing character. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework in so far as it seeks high quality design.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR