



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2020

by Rebecca Thomas MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3249060
8 Yolande Gardens, London SE9 5SX

- 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 E Bayram against the decision of the Council of the Royal London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/3728/HD, dated 28 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side and single storey rear extension at 8 Yolande Gardens, London SE9 5SX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 19/3728/HD, dated 28 October 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site location plan and drawing no. 1860/01 Rev D.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council altered the description of the development of application ref. 19/3728/HD to read "*Retention of two storey side and single storey rear extension*". The application and appeal documents were submitted to read "*Retrospective application of two storey side and single storey rear extension*". I have removed the words which are superfluous and I have considered the appeal before me accordingly.
3. It is clear from the appellant's and Council's submissions that the Council granted planning permission in February 2019 (reference 18/4397/HD) for "*Construction of a part one/part two storey rear and side wrap around extension incorporating a new entrance*" at 8 Yolande Gardens. From the evidence I have before me, it is apparent that this appeal proposal differs from the previously approved scheme predominantly to the side/rear element of the development. The appeal proposal would increase the depth of the rear

element at first floor, and increase the side element at both ground and first floor levels. The roof heights would be amended to accommodate the changes, also with some additional fenestration to the first floor at the front elevation. I was able to see at the time of my site visit that development had been started but appeared incomplete.

4. Notwithstanding the above, I have dealt with the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans before me.

Main Issue

5. From the evidence I have before me, I consider the main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. Yolande Gardens is a residential cul-de-sac characterised by a small number of semi-detached properties gathered around the turning circle of the street. The properties tend to be elevated from the street level, with driveways to the front. Properties have hipped gable roofs with symmetrical features such as windows and chimneys. Exterior finishes vary.
7. Number 8 is located at the end of the cul-de-sac and I was able to see at the time of my site visit that the neighbouring property, number 7, had been extended to the side and rear. At the time of my site visit, number 8 was partially obscured by scaffolding and sheeting. However, I was able to see that some building works had been started. The property has a pebble-dash frontage, with no. 7 having been rendered and painted.
8. The proposed development would introduce a two storey extension that tapers in width from back to front, reflecting the shape of the property boundary. The development would include a set back from the principle front elevation and the ridge would be lower than the original ridgeline. The roof would have a hipped gable, with a staggered roofline to allow for the change in width.
9. The proposed development would appear to me to reflect the extensions at no.7 and so would provide an element of symmetry to the two dwellings. In addition to this, the properties are located at the end of the street and I consider that the development would add to, rather than detract from, the character and appearance of the area because of adding to the symmetry.
10. I was able to see that the local area is characterised by the semi-detached dwellings with hipped gables and I was also able to see that a few dwellings had been extended in various ways. The proposed development at no.8 Yolande Gardens would not be harmful to the host dwelling and I consider there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the area.
11. The Council's SPG on residential extensions¹ sets out guidance on extensions, including stating that the width of the side extension being proportionate to the main house, and going on to say that the width should be less than half the width of the main house. The Council asserts that the side extension at its widest point is over half the width of the existing property at both ground and first floor level. Nevertheless, given the set back from the front elevation of

¹ Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (December 2018)

the house, coupled with the tapered design and the orientation of the building at an angle to the street lead me to conclude that the additional width is not significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

12. I therefore find no conflict with policies found within the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) nor the policies within the London Plan² or the policies in Core Strategy³, all of which expect a high quality of design from development, including being of a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality.

Other Matters

13. I note concerns raised with regard to fencing to the rear boundary of no. 8. This is not part of the appeal before me and as such does not form part of my decision in this instance.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard timescale for implementation condition, it is necessary to attach a condition confirming the approved drawings in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition to ensure that the external materials would match the existing.

Conclusion

15. I have found that there is no harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling nor to the local area. I therefore conclude that, subject to the above conditions, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be allowed.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR

² The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for London (March 2016)

³ Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014)