

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/17/3174795
52 Straightsmouth, Greenwich SE10 9LD

- 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 Morton against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 16/4154/F, dated 14 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 52 Straightsmouth, Greenwich SE10 9LD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/4154/F, dated 14 December 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:-
 - *Drawing Nos A101 & A102.*

Main Issues

2. I consider that the main issues are:-
 - whether the proposed extension would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the West Greenwich Conservation Area.
 - the effect of the extension on the living conditions of occupiers of the existing dwelling.

Reasons

Conservation Area

3. The appeal site is within the West Greenwich 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 West Greenwich Conservation Area Character Appraisal³.

4. The dwelling is a mid terraced house with a single story outrigger. The proposal would add a modest extension to the rear and replace the existing outrigger. It would be unusual in its design with part of it having a flat roof and part having a sloping roof but given its location to the rear of the house and its modest scale I do not consider that its scale or design would harm 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

5. Amongst other things the Council's SPD⁴ refers to the contribution that rear gardens make to local character and the visual and amenity standards of the existing dwelling. Whilst the extension is modest in size, the property also benefits from a certificate of lawfulness for an outbuilding⁵. Together these would reduce the size of the rear garden. However, at the time of my site visit the outbuilding had not been erected and the proposal before me is for the single storey extension.
6. The submitted plans show the outbuilding and indicate that the extension together with the outbuilding would leave a relatively small area of garden. However, the outbuilding does not form part of this proposal and in any case the proposed extension would not reduce the garden to such a scale as to leave the house with a poor standard of outdoor amenity space. I do not therefore consider that this proposal would conflict with the SPD.

Conditions

7. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of the Planning Practice Guidance⁶. 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

8. I have taken all matters raised into account including London Plan Policy 7.4 and 7.6 and Local Plan policies DH1 and DH(a). Neither these nor any other matter raised alters my conclusion. I conclude that the proposed extension

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 West Greenwich Conservation Area Appraisal 2013.

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

⁵ Ref: 16/4155/CP.

⁶ Planning Practice Guidance, 6 March 2014.

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 dwelling. 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