
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2016

by David Walker MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/16/3145656
2 Sunnydale Road, Lee, London SE12 8JN

- 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 Ms Sharon Dunne against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 15/3222/F, dated 30 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2015.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No 2 is a ground floor flat within a 3 storey block of flats forming part of an open plan estate and is located at the corner of Sunnydale and Lyme Farm Road. The appeal site is formed from part of the private rear garden to No 2 together with part of an open frontage adjacent to Sunnydale, also within the appellant's ownership.
 4. While Sunnydale also includes 2 storey terraced houses with front gardens, I find the open spaces around the blocks of flats of the area to be an important and determining characteristic that provides a spacious and pleasant landscaped setting to the bulk of the larger buildings.
 5. In this context the appeal site is particularly prominent and the large side and rearwards extension proposed would consume much of the open frontage. It would diminish the open setting to the flats to the detriment of the visual qualities of the area. Although the extension would fall within building lines established by existing blocks of development, I find these to be too far apart to be a reliable indicator of the suitability of the proposal within the local street scene.
 6. While the use of matching materials in an energy efficient construction are factors in support of the proposal these are not sufficient to outweigh the harmful effect on the character and appearance I have identified. The proposal would not therefore accord with the requirements of design Policies DH1 and
-

DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 (CS) for extensions to be of a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality, among other criteria. It would also conflict with the high quality design response and regard to the public realm sought by Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2015, notwithstanding that there would be no harmful effects on the living conditions of neighbours.

7. Although Policy DH(a) of the CS and the advice within Planning Guidance for Home Extensions 2004 seek to avoid flat roof extensions, the sloping and wrapped around roof form would remain in conflict as it would be out of character with the simple gable end and flat roof porches of the host building.
8. In forming my assessment I acknowledge the permitted side extension at 45 Shrewsbury Lane provided to me as an example of precedent. However, I do not find parallels between the two cases. That extension is located in a narrow gap between two existing houses whereas the appeal scheme would occupy a prominent corner in an open planned estate.
9. I have also had regard to the need for the accommodation to house the appellant's aged parents, including disabled Mother. The CS states that Policy DH(a) may be relaxed to enable a person with a disability to continue living in their own home. While I have some sympathy with the appellant's circumstances I have no evidence before me of existing need at the property to accord with the exemption set out within the CS. As planning is otherwise concerned with land use in the public interest this cannot therefore be a consideration that attracts significant weight in this case.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and with regard to the submissions of interested parties, which I acknowledge, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Walker

INSPECTOR