
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2017

by A A Phillips BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1 December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/17/3180249

17 Ankerdine Crescent, Plumstead SE18 3LH

- 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 Raimondas Chaikевичius against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 17/0697, dated 28 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension with skylight.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension with skylight at 17 Ankerdine Crescent, Plumstead SE18 3LH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/0697, dated 28 February 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, Block Plan, LPS 159/1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey three bedroom semi-detached residential property located within a predominantly residential area of Plumstead. The area surrounding the site is dominated by semi-detached and terraced houses of a similar age and character. At my site visit I noted that the adjoining property, No 15 has a two storey side extension. Other properties in the locality have been altered and extended in different ways.
4. It is my understanding that prior approval was granted in November 2016 for the formation of a loft conversion at the appeal property with a hip-to-gable end, rear dormer and roof light in the front roof slope. The current proposal is

for a two storey pitched roof side extension and a single storey rear extension. The proposed two storey extension presents a reduced ridge line, but is only slightly set back from the main frontage of the host property. It would project approximately 2.4 metres to the side of the original house.

5. The proposed two storey side extension would represent an approximate increase of forty per cent in the floor area of the property. However, the existing property is relatively modest in size and the extension has been designed to be subordinate. Indeed, it is a slender two storey addition which would not dominate the host property or appear as a visually intrusive or incongruous addition in the street scene where alterations and extensions are commonplace.
6. I am aware that permission has previously been granted for a loft conversion with alterations to the roof; however, I consider that the current proposal could complement the previously approved scheme without representing over development of the site in terms of height, scale and bulk. In addition a suitable gap would remain between the side elevation of the property and as such the proposal would not lead to a harmful terracing effect.
7. I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and would be in accordance with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies Adopted July 2014 and the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document July 2016. Among other objectives these seek to ensure that extensions are sensitive to the original building and buildings surrounding it and respect the street scene and character of the area.

Other Matters

8. One neighbour has objected for reasons relating to loss of light and outlook. However, a significant gap would remain along the side elevation of No 19 which would ensure adequate levels of light to the property and its associated private amenity space. As a consequence of the orientation of the extension in relation to No 19 I do not consider that the proposal would unduly harm the outlook from the adjacent residential property.

Conditions

9. I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty and I have also attached a condition requiring matching materials for external surfaces in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. Therefore, for the reasons given above and taking into account other matters raised I conclude that the proposal is in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole and that the appeal should be allowed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR