



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2019

by Euan FS Pearson BA(Hons) BTP FRGS MRICS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G570/D/18/3217340

73 Pulleyns Avenue, East Ham, London E6 3NA

- 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 Mrs Azhaghi Sunassee against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 18/02260/HH, dated 2 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2018.
 - The development proposed is erection of rear and side ground floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of rear and side ground floor extension at 73 Pulleyns Avenue, East Ham, London E6 3NA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/02260/HH, dated 2 August 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: N.A/73PA/001, N.A/73PA/002 and N.A/73PA/003;
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedure Matter

2. The decision notice refers to provisions of the Core Strategy 2012. The Council adopted the Newham Local Plan 2018 (Local Plan) in December 2018 and I have determined the appeal in accordance with the relevant adopted policies.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are (i) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwellinghouse and the surrounding area; and (ii) the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a traditional two storey terraced house with closet wing that has been extended to the rear. Neighbouring properties, on either side, 71 and 75 Pulleyns Avenue have also been extended to the rear, maintaining a narrow side passage for access to rear gardens.
5. The proposed development involves, following demolition, construction of a larger single storey extension across the width of the plot. The proposed extension would be about 2m deeper than the existing, and would result in the loss of the access passage, and a small part of the rear garden. I consider, that the resulting rectangular garden, about 8m deep, would be of an acceptable size.
6. Previously, the Council determined that, following application Ref 18/01756/PREHH, prior approval was not required for a similar single storey rear extension, to the same depth. That would involve a two stage rear extension. The stage attached to the rear of the dwelling would be across the full width of the plot. The second, attached to the first stage, would leave a narrow accessway. The appeal proposal is larger in that it would fill in the narrow accessway in the second stage so the whole extension would fill the full width of the plot. In effect, therefore, it would be less than 1m wider than the approved extension and no deeper.
7. I observed from my site visit that there is a variety of designs of rear extensions, on this section of Pulleyns Avenue, and not all to the same depth. Taking this into account, and having regard to the Council's prior approval determination, I do not consider that the proposed extension would be excessive in depth or height, and would be acceptable in its context. The extension would not be to the front of the appeal property and, I consider, would not have any effect on the terrace when viewed from the public realm.
8. I note that there are fencing panels, about 1.8m in height, along the boundary between the appeal property's side passage and that of No 75 blocking views between side ground floor windows/doors and giving a sense of enclosure. I consider that the development proposed in 18/01756/PREHH would result in a more significant effect on doors/windows and an increased sense of enclosure, particularly in the side passage. I consider that the passage is too narrow to function as amenity space. The additional full width part of the extension would not, therefore, make those effects significantly worse.
9. The Council considers that there would be no unacceptable impacts on No 71, and I see no reason to disagree.
10. Therefore, I consider, that the proposed development would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse or surrounding area, nor would it unacceptably impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants. As such, the proposal accords with Policies 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016; Policy SP8 of Newham Local Plan 2018; the Council's Altering and Extending Your Home, Supplementary Planning Document 2018; and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019. Amongst other things, these require a high standard of design of development, appropriate to the host building and local context, that would not result in adverse impact on neighbouring properties.

Conditions

11. I have imposed conditions with regard to the commencement of the proposed development and the details of the approved plans, in the interests of certainty. I have also required that the materials match the existing dwelling, to ensure that the extension would be in keeping with the host dwelling and those neighbouring.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Euan FS Pearson

INSPECTOR