

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2017

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) MCD DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/17/3174729

26 Ulundi Road, Blackheath SE3 7UG

- 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 Judith Bunzl against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 16/2763/F, dated 23 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is ground floor rear kitchen/living extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor rear kitchen/living extension at 26 Ulundi Road, Blackheath SE3 7UG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/2763/F, dated 23 August 2016, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:-
 - *Location Plan – Drawing No sDNA/303/100.*
 - *Existing Plans – Drawing Nos: sDNA/303/101; sDNA/303/102; sDNA/303/103; sDNA/303/104; sDNA/303/105; sDNA/303/110; and sDNA/303/111.*
 - *Proposed Plans – Drawing Nos: sDNA/303/201; sDNA/303/202; sDNA/303/203; sDNA/303/204; sDNA/303/205; sDNA/303/210; sDNA/303/211; and sDNA/303/212*

Main Issues

2. I consider that the main issues are
 - whether the proposed extension would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Westcombe Park Conservation Area; and
-

- the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring residential properties.

Reasons

Conservation Area

3. The appeal site is within the Westcombe Park Conservation Area and I have had regard to the fact that Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. This is reflected in Local Plan Policy DH(h)¹. Also relevant are Local Plan Policy DH3 and London Plan Policy 7.8², which relate to heritage assets, and the Westcombe Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal³.
4. The dwelling is a three storey Victorian house and the proposal is to construct a modern single storey extension to the rear. This would wrap around the existing two-storey outrigger, filling in the space between the outrigger and the boundary to No 28 and projecting a short distance further to the rear than the outrigger. The lower section of a two-storey bay feature would be removed in order to accommodate this modern addition.
5. The extension would be to the rear of the house and be single storey with a flat roof. I do not consider that its scale or design would compromise the integral design of the dwelling itself. Nor do I consider that it would have an adverse impact on the wider area. I therefore consider that proposal would preserve the character of the Conservation Area and no conflict with Local Plan policies DH(h) or DH3 or Policy 7.8 of the London Plan, would occur.

Living Conditions

6. Local Plan Policy DH(b) seeks to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers by only permitting development that would not reduce daylight, sunlight or privacy or result in an unneighbourly sense of enclosure. Amongst other things the Council's SPD⁴ requires all extensions to respect the amenity of neighbours particularly their privacy, daylight, sunlight and avoid a sense of enclosure.
7. No 24 is a similar designed house as No 26 and also has a rear outrigger. The extension would extend only a short distance beyond the rear outrigger and I do not consider that it would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 24. The extension would be close to the boundary with No 28 and it would extend a considerable way beyond the main rear wall of the house, just beyond the rear wall of the outrigger. However, it would be single storey and have a flat roof. Its impact therefore would not adversely affect the outlook from No 28 nor would it result in an undue sense of enclosure. I do not consider that the living conditions of the occupiers of No 28 would be harmed and no conflict with Policy DH(b) would arise.

¹ Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, Adopted 30 July 2014.

² Mayor of London The London Plan – The spatial development strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011, March 2016.

³ Westcombe Park Character Appraisal, March 2010.

⁴ Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document, July 2016.

Conditions

8. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of the Planning Practice Guidance⁵. A condition requiring the materials to match the existing house is necessary to ensure that the external appearance of the extension is satisfactory. It is also necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Conclusion

9. I have taken all other matters raised into account including London Plan Policy 7.4 and Local Plan policies DH1 and DH(a) and also the comments made from a neighbour, the Westcombe Society and the Greenwich Conservation Group. Neither these nor any other matter raised alters my conclusion. I conclude that the proposed extension would preserve the character of the Conservation Area and it would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring residential properties. The proposal would not conflict with Policy 7.8 of the London Plan or Local Plan policies DH(h) or DH3 or the Council's SPD. Therefore the appeal succeeds.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

⁵ Planning Practice Guidance, 6 March 2014.