
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3236415

26 Albatross Street, Plumstead SE18 2RZ

- 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 Mrs Kelly against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 19/1786/HD, dated 15 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear infill extension and conservatory to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear infill extension and conservatory to the rear at 26 Albatross Street, Plumstead SE18 2RZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/1786/HD, dated 15 May 2019, 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 approved plans: Site Location Plan, Block/Site Plan and 26ALBER/001/V1.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of the development in reaching my decision as it more fully describes the details of the development than that given on the original planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, adjoining terrace properties and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property at No. 26 Albatross Street (No. 26) is a two storey end-terrace dwelling with a two storey outrigger and single storey extension at the rear. It is located in a prominent corner position at the end of a row of terraced

properties within a mature well-established residential area. It is situated set back from the road running along the side of the property behind a footpath and a small rear garden enclosed by a high boundary wall. A number of the dwellings in the area are built close to the highway and have single and two storey extensions attached at the rear that generally appear as clearly subordinate to the main house.

5. The proposal would involve the construction of two storey rear infill extension and rear conservatory across the full width of the house. The two storey extension would project out by about 2.8m from the rear elevation of the house and would be constructed with a shallow mono-pitched tiled roof.
6. The Council's Residential Extensions, Basement and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document July 2016 (SPD) states that two storey rear extensions should be in keeping with the size of the original house and have as little impact as possible on the character of the house, neighbouring properties and street scene.
7. Whilst the proposed rear extensions would be located in a prominent position, they would be seen in the context of the existing extensions and alterations to No. 26 and the nearby properties built close to the highway. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and design of the single storey and two storey rear extensions would not appear significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the nearby properties.
8. The modest overall increase of the two storey rear projection together with the use of matching materials and fenestrations would ensure the proposal would sit relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the main property. The proposal would therefore achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and as such would not detract from the architectural integrity of the host property, adjoining terrace properties and the area.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property, adjoining terrace properties and the area. It would be consistent 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 July 2014 and the SPD. These policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is of a high quality of design that respects the local context in terms of appearance, scale and design of the scheme and responds to the character of the area.
10. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 55, I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the external surfaces of the development match those of the existing property.
11. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR