



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 September 2020 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3253227

32 Kingsholm Gardens, Eltham, SE9 6LD

- 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 & Mrs Olaigbe against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 20/0659/HD, dated 18 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear and side extension at 32 Kingsholm Gardens, Eltham, SE9 6LD in accordance with the terms of the application 20/0659/HD, dated 18 February 2020, subject to these 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; Block Plan drawing no. K.32/02 revision 00; Proposed Plans drawing no. G002/01; and Proposed Elevations drawing no. G002/02 revision A.
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The drawing titled 'Proposed Elevations' (drawing no. G002/02) submitted with the appeal documents contained a discrepancy where the ridge line of the proposed extension was shown at different heights on the front and rear elevation drawings. An amended drawing was requested and received (drawing no. G002/02 revision A), which corrects the inconsistency. This revised drawing has been sent to the Council for their information, and forms part of the drawings on which my recommendation is based.
-

4. The description of development is taken from the application form. However, the Council's second reason for refusal also refers to a single storey rear extension. This extension is shown on the submitted drawings and was granted planning permission in 2017 through the larger house extension prior notification process¹. At the time of my site visit, the single-storey rear extension had been constructed up to roof level. On the basis of all I have seen and read, as the extension has planning permission and is not referred to in the description of development, I am satisfied that it does not form part of this proposal and falls outside the scope of this appeal. This appeal will therefore focus solely on the proposed two-storey side and rear extension.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in Kingsholm Gardens. The street is comprised of a mix of semi-detached and terraced properties built to a similar design, some of which have been previously extended. The proposed development would see the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension.
7. The appeal site is adjacent to an open space, described by the Council as a linear park/electrical easement, which separates the appeal property from No 34 Kingsholm Gardens and gives the appearance of the appeal site as a corner plot. There are several of these linear parks in the estate, forming two distinct lines of green space and pavements though the estate, which creates a green and spacious character to the area.
8. Section 5 of the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance - Supplementary Planning Document (December 2018) (SPD) states that any extension would need to be in keeping with the size of the original house and not appear bulky, that side extensions should accurately reflect the style of the main house and remain secondary in size and appearance, and that two-storey side extensions must be designed so as to avoid the loss of the open character between properties.
9. To achieve these aims, the SPD states that the roof of the side extension should reflect the roof pitch of the original house, that the ridge height of the roof of a side extension should be set below the existing ridge height to ensure the extension is secondary to the original house, that a side extension should normally be set back slightly from the front wall of the house to allow the original house to remain prominent, and that the width a side extension should be less than half the width of the main house. For corner plots, the SPD says that the extension should be set back from the boundary by one metre and be proportionate to the dimensions of the main house in order to maintain the open aspect and protect the character of the street.
10. The proposed side extension would be less than half the width of the original dwelling and would be set back slightly from the front elevation. The roof pitch of the extension would match the existing roof pitch, and the ridge line of the extension would be stepped down from the main roof. As a result, the proposed

¹ Planning application ref. 17/3193/PN1

extension would appear subservient to the main dwelling and would meet the requirements of the relevant sections of the SPD. The proposed extension would not be set in one metre from the boundary. Nevertheless, a significant gap would remain between the appeal property and No 34 as a result of the linear park, and as such the proposed extension would not appear cramped and moreover, would preserve the spacious character of the street scene. Therefore, while the proposal would not meet the requirement of the SPD in this respect, the proposal would satisfy the aims of the SPD to maintain the open aspect and protect the character of the street and to prevent a negative impact on the original house and its surroundings.

11. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed two-storey side and rear extension would respect the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore accord with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (March 2016) (LP), Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy (July 2014) (CS), and the aims of the SPD. These policies all seek, in various ways, for the development to be of a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality.

Conditions

12. I recommend the standard time limit condition and a condition specifying the approved plans to provide certainty and in the interests of proper planning.
13. In the interests of the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene, it is necessary to attach a condition that requires the materials of the external surfaces of the development to match the external materials of the existing property.
14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted subject to the conditions listed above.

D Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted subject to the conditions above.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR