
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/17/3174916
32 Camelot Close, Thamesmead SE28 0ES

- 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 V Ayadurai against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 17/0173/F, dated 18 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is erection of two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey side extension at 32 Camelot Close, Thamesmead SE28 0ES in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/0173/F, dated 18 January 2017, 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:-
 - *KD/EXT/PP/76/14/C-172.1 Revision: R3 23.12.2016;*
 - *KD/EXT/PP/76/14/C-172.2 Revision: R3 23.12.2016; and*
 - *KD/EXT/PP/76/14/C-172.3 Revision: R3 23.12.2016.*

Main Issues

2. I consider that the main issues are the effect of the proposed extension on (1) the character and appearance of the area and (2) the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring residential property.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a modest sized two-storey house with a generous side garden. The estate has a particular design in terms of its style of dwellings and use of materials. No 32 Camelot Close is attached to No 31 and No 33 is set
-

back behind No 32. The spacing between these properties contributes to the overall design style of the estate. However, I can see no reason why the appeal site cannot evolve over time provided that the design of alteration is of a quality and standard that meets the requirements in London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6¹ and Local Plan policies DH1 and DH(a)².

4. Amongst other things, London Plan 7.4 requires buildings, streets and open spaces to provide a high standard of design and sets out criteria to achieve this. Policy 7.6 requires buildings and structures to be of the highest architectural quality. Local Plan Policy DH1 establishes that in order to achieve a high quality of design, all developments are expected to meet a list of criteria. Policy DH(a) sets out criteria for residential extensions. Of relevance to this issue is that the proposed extension should respect the scale and character of the host building, the street scene and the surrounding area.
5. Whilst the size of the original house would be considerably enlarged, I do not consider that the scale of the proposed extension is unduly excessive. I consider that the design of the extension would be sympathetic to the existing house; it would not be obtrusive, dominant or incongruous and therefore I find that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the area. I am satisfied that the proposal would not conflict with policies 7.4, 7.6, DH1 or DH(a) in relation to this issue.

Living Conditions

6. Amongst other things, London Plan Policy 7.6 requires that buildings and structures should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding residential buildings in relation to privacy and overshadowing. 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 SPD³ requires all extensions to respect the amenity of neighbours particularly their privacy, daylight, sunlight and avoid a sense of enclosure.
7. No 33 Camelot Close is located to the south-east of No 32. It has windows to the front and side and the proposed extension would extend No 32 closer to it. However, the positioning of these houses is such that the extension would not result in overshadowing nor would there be an undue sense of enclosure or harm to outlook. I do not therefore find that the living conditions of the occupiers of No 33 would be harmed and no conflict with London Plan Policy 7.6, Local Plan DH(b) or the SPD would occur.

Conditions

8. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of the Planning Practice Guidance⁴. 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

¹ Mayor of London The London Plan – The spatial development strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011, March 2016.

² Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, Adopted 30 July 2014.

³ Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document, July 2016.

⁴ Planning Practice Guidance, 6 March 2014.

carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Conclusion

9. I have considered all other matters raised but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposed two-storey side extension would not have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the area nor would the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring residential property be harmed. The proposal would not conflict with policies 7.4, 7.6 of the London Plan, DH1 or DH(b) of the Local Plan or the Council's SPD and therefore the appeal succeeds.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR