



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2019

by Euan FS Pearson BA(Hons) BTP FRGS MRICS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3220212

28 Chelsworth Drive, Plumstead, London SE18 2RA

- 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 Emmanuel Okeke against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 18/3098/HD, dated 29 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is construction of a part 1 and part 2 side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building, the street scene and the area surrounding the appeal site.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey dwellinghouse, that has previously been extended (roof rear dormer) at the eastern end of a terrace of three (28-32 Chelsworth Drive). The appeal property occupies a corner plot at the junction with Erindale from where it is visually prominent, due to changes in levels.
4. It is proposed to extend the appeal property both: to the side (part two storey and part single storey) and single storey to the rear. It is also proposed to construct a raised patio with balustrade and steps into the rear garden.
5. The proposed side extension would be irregular in shape and would infill the space between the dwellinghouse and the boundary wall along Erindale; and extend about 3m further back into the rear garden. The overall width of the property fronting Chelsworth Drive would be increased to around 9m, to a height of two storeys. The rear of the property would almost double in width.
6. The side extension's eastern elevation would have no windows. At ground floor level the side rear/extension would present a substantial blank façade, visible from the street. This would result in an inappropriate design of extension, dominating the original dwellinghouse and thus would cause harm. The inclusion of the ballustraded, raised patio would add to this overdominance.

7. Increasing the size of the ground floor through the proposed extensions would, I consider, result in a very significant enlargement of the footprint of the original dwellinghouse. This, taken with the existing roof dormer, proposed two storey addition with pyramid hip roof, and additional ground floor accommodation with combination roofs, to the side and rear, would not give the appearance of diminutive physical extensions.
8. As the extension would infill almost all of the open garden space at the junction with Erindale, at the heights proposed, for a length of approximately 11.5m, it would appear bulky and incongruous and would have the effect of detracting from the general balance and symmetry of the terraced properties. The proposed use of various roof styles would not respect or mimic the original dwellinghouse and add emphasise the effect of harm, to the surrounding area.
9. For the collective reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed extensions by virtue of their inappropriate design, overall size and bulk would have a significantly detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, street scene and the appeal property. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with London Plan 2016 policies 7.4 and 7.6; policies DH1 and DH(a) of Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014; Section 5 of the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016; and the National Planning Policy Framework, all of which, amongst other things, require a high quality of design that is appropriate and makes a positive contribution to the locality.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has submitted various photographs of other properties in the local area with large extensions and made reference to earlier decisions to grant planning permission at 26 and 35 Chelsworth Drive. I note that these decisions were taken when the Unitary Development Plan was extant. Notwithstanding this, planning decisions are based on merit, and the presence of other extensions does not justify granting planning permission given the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Euan FS Pearson

INSPECTOR