
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2016

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/16/3160147
118 Glennie Road, London SE27 0LU

- 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 Salvatore Di Bartolo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 16/02668/FUL, dated 29 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The submitted plans do not show the existing elevations of the dwelling accurately. A large roof dormer is positioned on the rear roof slope and the dwelling has a gable rather than hipped roof. These discrepancies make no difference to the proposal which would be single storey at ground floor level.

Main Issues

3. The first main issue is the effect of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the area, particularly the street-scene along Egremont Road that backs onto the site. The second is the effect of the extension upon the living conditions of the occupiers at the existing dwelling with respect to the size and quality of available amenity space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is positioned at the end of Glennie Road, adjacent to the junction with Royal Circus and Chartham Grove. The back of the dwelling is prominent into Egremont Road, separated from the footpath alongside the road by a narrow garden enclosed by a brick wall with trellis above. These streets include rows of mainly similar tight-knit terraced dwellings.
 5. The other terraced dwellings backing onto this side of Egremont Road are in a line that graduates back from the road as they have been constructed on a wedge shaped area of land. The rear garden lengths therefore increase to the west. The longer rear boundaries of the other gardens include a variety of fences, walls and also some outbuildings with doors accessed directly onto the
-

pavement. They are also more spacious with landscaping which helps soften the street-scene.

6. The proposed flat roof extension would fill the entire width of the widest part of the garden adjoining No 116. The rear wall of the extension would be on the back edge of the footpath. It would clearly appear as part of the dwelling with the side window and roof lantern being prominent into Egremont Road as well as being visible from nearby Chartham Grove. The short depth of garden would emphasise the impact of the development. It would not appear as a subordinate outbuilding like those mainly timber garden structures further along the road. There would be little space for any effective landscaping to soften the appearance of the structure.
7. The proposal would not be within the 'front' garden but it would be very prominent. The sensitivities referred to in paragraph 6.6 of the SPD¹ relating to front gardens are relatable in these circumstances. In relation to the main issue, the proposal would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the area and street-scene along Egremont Road. This would not comply with Policies Q2, Q8 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan² (LP).

Living conditions

8. The dwelling currently has a small garden behind the brick wall around the rear and side. Due to the slope of the land, there is some privacy within the area to the side closest to Chartham Grove. The garden is already limited in size and the extension would involve its reduction further. The Council has not referred to any specific required standards for garden sizes. I will therefore reach my own conclusions based upon what the relevant LP Policies try to achieve.
9. LP policy Q2 explains that adequate outdoor amenity space should be free from excessive noise or disturbance, pollution or odour or oppressive enclosure. I have no evidence before me to explain how affected by such factors this property is. Given its physical limitations already, people using the garden will be subject to impacts from sounds within the surrounding roads and the space is not very private. The area was quiet at the time of my visit but that is a small snapshot in time. The garden at the moment will already be affected by external factors and I am not convinced that the development will make them any worse. The remaining garden area would be limited but there would be some space for children to play and for occupiers of the dwelling to sit out.
10. Based upon the information available, in relation to the second main issue, the extension would not have an unacceptable impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers at the existing dwelling. This would not breach LP policy Q2.

Overall Conclusion

11. My conclusion on the second main issue does not outweigh my concerns in relation to the first. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andy Harwood

INSPECTOR

¹ Building Alterations and Extensions, Supplementary Planning Document, September 2015

² Lambeth Local Plan, adopted September 2015