



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2017

by R Barrett Bsc (Hons) MSc Dip Hist Cons Dip UD MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 14th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/17/3181135

150 Moordown, Plumstead SE18 3NF

- 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 Yusuf Budak against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 17/1265/F, dated 18 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension and sub-division of dwelling into two dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The effect of the appeal proposal on the Royal Borough's stock of small and medium sized family dwellings, the character and appearance of the locality and whether it would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers, with regard to garden space.

Reasons

Small and Medium Sized Family Dwellings

3. The appeal property has a large two storey extension. That accommodation, together with the proposed single storey extension would provide the proposed new two bedroom dwelling. The original part of the terraced house, as defined by both main parties, would be retained as a separate dwelling and direct access could be provided to a garden area. I note that the original dwelling was small and below the threshold for conversion for a terraced house, as defined by Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) (CS) Policy H(b). However, the appeal proposal would retain the original small or medium sized family dwelling. CS Policy H(b) seeks to do just that. Therefore, I consider that the stock of small and medium family sized dwellings would not be adversely affected by the appeal proposal. For this reason, it would generally accord with CS Policy H(b), in this regard. It would also generally accord with Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016), in as much as it would retain the original dwelling.

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site includes the end unit of a small terrace which fronts onto a roundabout. The appeal property is sited on a hillside, in a residential estate. The locality includes generally similar terraces of three to six properties. Even though some have been changed over time and some extended, including that at No.152, brought to my attention, a striking characteristic of those properties fronting onto the roundabout is their symmetry in layout and design. This is the case, even though there is some variation in levels throughout this locality.
5. I note that the two storey side extension at the appeal property has compromised the space to one side. However, this proposal would add to that imbalance. It would further erode the gap between the appeal house and the boundary, which would diminish the characteristic spacing pattern between the terraces. As it would almost fill the small triangular area of garden left, it would appear cramped on the site. With its front door facing the side, as viewed from the roundabout, the resultant building would have the appearance of one large dwelling and appear out of scale in relation to its attached neighbours. Whilst it would help to break up the flank elevation of the existing two storey extension in some views, that matter does not outweigh the unacceptable harm that I have identified. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposed extension would be on ground lower than the road and partly obscured in some views by the existing garage, those matters do not materially affect my conclusions on this matter. Similarly, the removal of the garage would not materially affect the views of the proposed extension from the roundabout identified.
6. In coming to the above judgement, I have had regard to my Colleague's decisions at the appeal site (APP/E5330/A/08/2070103 and 2065241). Whilst there have been some changes in circumstances since then, including the two storey extension at the appeal site, I come to a similar view to that Inspector.
7. Overall, I conclude that the appeal proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the locality. It would therefore fail to accord with CS Policy DH1, DH(a) and H(b) in this respect. Those policies, together, aim for all developments to be of a high quality of design and for proposals for residential extensions to be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building. Further, they aim that conversions should not adversely affect the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Living Conditions

8. The appeal site includes both a front and rear garden. The appeal plans indicate that the appeal site could be divided, such that each dwelling would have direct access to garden space. In principle, a boundary could provide satisfactory privacy within the rear garden space. I have no evidence before me to suggest that the details of any boundary treatment could not be determined at a later stage. On this basis, I conclude that the proposed development would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers, with regard to garden space. It would therefore generally accord with CS Policy H5. That policy aims for new residential development including conversions to achieve a high quality of housing design.

Conclusion

9. Whilst I have found that the appeal proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the stock of family dwellings in the Royal Borough and would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers, with regard to garden space, I have found unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the locality would be a consequence. I acknowledge that a new dwelling suitable for a family would be provided. However, that does not overcome the unacceptable harm identified to the character and appearance of the locality; a matter that is determinative in this case.
10. For the above reasons, and taking all other matters raised into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Barrett

INSPECTOR