



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 29 September 2020 by Sarah Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3254533

28 Thornhill Avenue, Plumstead, LONDON, SE18 2HS

- 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 Mohammad Asghar against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/4209/HD, dated 10 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the 1) character and appearance of the appeal property and the area and 2) living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at No. 26 in way of daylight, sunlight and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. No. 28 is a two-storey end of terrace property which is linked to a semi-detached property by a single storey side addition. It is located in a residential area. At the rear is an existing single storey flat roof extension and mono pitched side addition which combined covers the width of the plot.
5. The proposal seeks to develop a two-storey flat roof extension across part of the rear elevation and above a section of the existing single storey extension. There would be an additional single storey element projecting out from this. It would be set in from the shared boundary with No. 26 and separated from the shared boundary with No.30 by the existing single storey linked side addition. As a result of the flat roof at first floor, the proposal would appear to add considerable bulk and mass to the rear elevation which would fail to reflect the existing character and roof profile of the host property.
6. Its proposed flat roof form would create a top-heavy addition with its bulky form at odds with the original and neighbouring properties where flat roofs are

not a prevailing characteristic. Moreover, the proposed ground floor element would introduce a further mono pitched roof which would be in contrast to the proposed first floor flat roof. When combined with the flat roof of the existing single storey rear extension and the pitched roof of the existing side addition the result would be a significant contrast in roof profiles, including variation in the proposed and existing eaves and ridge heights. This would create a mismatch of irregular forms at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of No. 28 and neighbouring properties.

7. Given its rear location, I accept that visibility from the street of the ground floor element would not arise and that views of the first-floor element would be limited from street view to short views on approach to the property. However, it would nonetheless represent poor design, inappropriate to the building and the area more generally. Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, taking account of local character. That applies to all development, irrespective of its prominence in the public realm. The proposal as such does not accord with the guidance contained within the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (2018) (SPD) which seeks development to be sensitive to the original character of the building and the surrounding area.
8. On this main issue I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area. The proposal would therefore be in conflict with Policy 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 (LP) and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 (CS). Amongst other things, these policies require extensions to be of a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality.

Living conditions

9. The Council note that the proposal would impact on the living conditions of No. 26 as the 45-degree test fails in regard to the proposed elevation. However, they have not referenced the policy or guidance for applying this test. Nevertheless, from what I saw on site and having regard to the submitted drawings, given the siting of the proposal, the distance from the shared boundary with No. 26, the orientation of the dwellings, the presence of the existing single storey extension which is directly adjacent to the boundary, and the long and open rear gardens, I find the proposal would not result in a loss of sunlight or daylight or affect the outlook of the occupiers of No. 26. The proposal thereby accords with the guidance contained within the SPD which seeks to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
10. On this main issue I find that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No. 26 in way of daylight, sunlight and outlook. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy DH(b) of the CS and policy 7.6 of the LP which advocate that proposals should not prejudice the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has provided details of other developments that they state set design precedents. The details relating to the development at Mottingham appears to have a different site layout and relationship with neighbouring

properties to those before me. In addition, there are no elevation drawings provided for me to compare. The details submitted regarding the development in Bowmead lacks elevation drawings and the site context does not appear comparable with the appeal site before me. The development in Kings Orchid appears to relate to a large detached property. Reference to these other examples does not lead me to alter my recommendation and I am unable to give significant weight to the issues of precedent.

12. The appellant has also referred to the aims of paragraph 127 of the Framework with regard to making the best and optimum use of land. Whilst I recognise those intentions, the existing dwelling is proportionate to the scale of its plot and the surrounding area and the desire to increase the level of accommodation does not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the property and the area.

Conclusion

13. Whilst I have found the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at No. 26, this does not outweigh the harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.
14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Witherley

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR