



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2024

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/23/3330313

6 Tom Nolan Close, Stratford, Newham, London E15 3AU

- 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 Roger and Gloria Hylton against the decision of the London Borough of Newham Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01294/HH, dated 9 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is a part two storey, part single storey wraparound extension, garage conversion to gym/home office.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part two storey, part single storey wraparound extension, garage conversion to gym/home office at 6 Tom Nolan Close, Stratford, Newham, London E15 3AU, in accordance with the terms of the application, 23/01294/HH, dated 9 June 2023, 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: BL/DRG/3177/02 Rev A, BL/DRG/3177/05 Rev A and BL/DRG/3177/06 Rev 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi-detached house, with small front and rear gardens, which sits towards the end of the close. To the side and rear of the appeal dwelling there is off street parking for one car in front of a detached dual garage structure with two separate garages, only one of which relates to the appeal property. The appeal dwelling is of a design and scale which reflects that of the other semi-detached and terraced houses in the close and this part of the surrounding estate development.

4. At ground floor, the part ground and part first floor extension would wraparound the whole of the existing rear ground floor elevation and part of the flank elevation which faces onto the appeal dwelling's parking space. At first floor level the proposed extension would be set in from the boundary of the appeal dwelling with its semi-detached pair, with a window at first floor level to its side facing the existing parking area, rather than to the narrow front facing elevation. The proposed extension would project rearward by approximately 3.5 metres and to the side by approximately 1.35 metres.
5. This would align with the side of the existing garage and sit on the line of the existing garden fence, leaving space for a garden gate between the two. As the proposal would sit partly to the side of the existing dwelling, it would visually fill the space between the appeal dwelling and the dual garage structure.
6. However, the nature of the close development is such that there is no continuous building line, and the side and rear positioning results in it appearing as a secondary and subordinate addition to the appeal dwelling. This would be further accentuated by the roof of the two storey part of the proposed extension, which would have a hipped roof form, set substantially down from the ridge of the existing roof. This would reflect the pitch of the roof appeal dwelling, hipping with it and the gable end.
7. In wider street views of the appeal dwelling from within the close, the design, form, rearward positioning and subordinate appearance of the proposed extension would result in it appearing to reflect the local streetscene, where flank walls without windows form a substantial part of the appearance of the local area. As such the proposal would result in the appeal dwelling appearing to sit comfortably within the existing streetscene, preserving the prevailing character and local distinctiveness of the area, rather than as an incongruous addition to it.
8. I agree with both parties to this appeal that the proposed conversion of the garage to create additional living space would come with only minor changes that would have no significant effect on its appearance or that of the local area.
9. For these reasons, the proposed part two storey, part single storey wraparound extension and garage conversion would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area. The proposal would, therefore, accord with the guidance set out in the Newham Altering and Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document (2018), Policies SP1, SP3 and SP8 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan (2018), Policies D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Section 12 of the Framework. These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions and alterations, is of high quality design, securing integration and coherence with local context.
10. The Council's decision notice sets out that the proposal would be contrary to Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan (2021). I have not come to this same conclusion, as Policies D1 and D4 relate to design management procedures and policy guidance for London planning authorities.

Conditions

11. Along with the standard condition setting out the time limit for commencement of the development, and in the interests of design quality, I have included

conditions requiring compliance with approved plans and use of materials that match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

12. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR