



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: 24 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3229725

34 Eastview Avenue, Plumstead SE18 2HT

- 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 Abdi Yusuf against the decision of The Council of The Royal London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/0640/HD, dated 21 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a "part double storey, part single storey rear extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. At the time of my visit a large ground floor extension had been constructed and was nearing completion. As noted in the Council's reasons for refusal, this extension is not shown on the plans submitted as part of this application. In the interests of clarity, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans submitted and considered by the Council as part of the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, No 34 Eastview Avenue, is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling. The road, and consequently the terrace of which No 34 is part, slopes downwards towards No 40 at the opposite end.
5. The proposed development is a part ground floor, part first floor rear extension. At ground floor level the extension would span the width of the entire rear elevation of the dwelling and would include a large roof lantern above. The first floor element would cover a proportion, though not all, of the width of the dwelling.
6. The proposed development would appear excessively large and would be an unsympathetic addition to the host property. Due to its scale and mass the

proposed extension would appear bulky and would dominate the rear elevation of the property. The proposal would fail to appear subordinate to the host dwelling and would represent a disproportionately large addition which would fail to respect its scale and proportions.

7. The raised ground level at No 34 compared with the rest of the terrace would exacerbate the excessively large appearance of the proposal when viewed in the context of the terrace as a whole.
8. I acknowledge that prior approval has been granted for a rear extension (19/0069/PN1) and that a Lawful Development Certificate has also been granted for a loft conversion (19/0075/CP) at the property. However, in my view the proposal would not complement the additions which have been granted permission. The proposal would, instead, lead to the appearance of an unsympathetic, piecemeal development which would overwhelm the host dwelling and fail to respect its proportions.
9. I note that the proposal would not be readily visible from the street. However, it would be prominent in views from surrounding properties and their gardens. I have given careful regard to other examples which are considered to represent similar schemes to that before me. However, these examples do not appear in the same immediate visual context as the appeal property and the specifics of those schemes are different to those present in this case. 57 Duncroft, for example, appears to be a semi-detached rather than terraced property, and the situation in respect of ground levels is markedly different at 37 Eastview Avenue. In any event, each case must be treated on its own merits and the other examples do not dissuade me from the conclusions I have reached in respect of this proposal.
10. The existence of other examples, the benefits to the appellant of additional living space and the limited visibility of the proposal from the public realm are not sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified above.
11. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.
12. The proposal would, therefore, fail to accord with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, adopted July 2014 (CS) and the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document, July 2016. Amongst other things, these 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 proposed development 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, including the letter of support from a neighbouring resident, I dismiss the appeal.

L J O'Brien

INSPECTOR