



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

by **L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th September 2019.

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3229731 69 Warland Road, Plumstead SE18 2ES

- 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 Miss Chandrasekara against the decision of The Council of the Royal London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/0458/HD, dated 7 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the interests of clarity, I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form rather than that found on the original application form. These documents describe the development as demolition of existing rear conservatory and construction of a part one/part two storey rear extension with the installation of replacement windows to side and rear elevation.
3. I attended the site at the specified time but was not met by the appellant or the appellant's agent. However, I was able to assess all relevant considerations from the driveway and, having sought agreement from the agent via the Case Officer, proceeded to complete the site visit unaccompanied.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property, No 69 Warland Road, is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling situated on a residential road. Along the side boundary, the property has a driveway leading to a low level gate and fence and the rear garden beyond.
6. The rear elevation of No 69 has a part rendered, part glazed conservatory. The proposed development is to demolish the existing conservatory and replace it with a part single, part two, storey rear extension. Replacement windows would also be installed at the property.

7. The single storey element of the proposal would span the entire width of the rear elevation of the dwelling and would have a pitched roof with a velux window or rooflight. The first floor element would not stretch the full width of the property, however, it would project a substantial distance from the rear elevation.
8. Due to its excessive size, the proposed extension would appear disproportionately large. It would represent an unsympathetic addition which would fail to respect the scale and proportions of the host building. The proposal would dominate the rear elevation of the dwelling and fail to appear subordinate.
9. I acknowledge the appellant's efforts to create an acceptable scheme by reducing the size so that the dimensions fall within some of the standards set by the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document, July 2016 (SPD). However, these dimensions are guidelines with the aim of preventing harm and encouraging good design.
10. I also note that the SPD states that two storey rear extensions are *often* and not *always*¹ discouraged. The SPD goes on to say, though, that any extension would need to be in keeping with the size of the original house and not appear bulky.
11. In this instance the proposal would not conform with the wider aims of the SPD which states that all new residential extensions should be sensitive to the original building, and buildings around it, and respect the street scene and character of the area. This is to ensure that extensions would have as little impact as possible on the character of the house, neighbouring properties, and the street scene.
12. For the reasons outlined above, the proposed extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. The proposed development would therefore conflict with policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, adopted July 2014 (CS). Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that developments are of a high quality design and proposals for residential extensions are limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality.
13. The proposal would also conflict with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, March 2016. These policies encourage high quality design and state that buildings should have regard to the pattern and grain of existing spaces and streets in orientation, scale, proportion and mass.
14. There would also be a failure to conform with the National Planning Policy Framework which promotes high standards of design and states that developments should be visually attractive and sympathetic to the character of the area.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J O'Brien

INSPECTOR

¹ My emphasis