
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2020

by Baljit K Muston BA(Hons) PGDip MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3249806

63 Marmadon Road, London SE18 1EA

- 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 Erwin George against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 20/0318/HD, dated 31 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey ground floor side extension and alterations to the front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether discrepancies in the submitted plans make it impossible to adequately assess the impact of the proposed development.

Reasons

3. The Council has refused the application on the grounds that discrepancies and inaccuracies in the submitted plans mean that a proper and accurate assessment of the proposals is not possible.
4. There are indeed material discrepancies in the appeal drawings between one plan and another, affecting, amongst other things, the height and depth of the proposed porch and the height of the proposed rear extension. This makes it difficult to accurately assess the impact of the proposals and impossible to grant a permission to the appeal scheme, as it would not be clear exactly what was being permitted.
5. The appellant argues that the same plans were used by the Council to assess and approve a Certificate of Lawfulness application (ref 20/0319/CP) in February 2020. However, that application was in relation to whether a loft conversion, including a dormer window and rooflights, needed planning permission. As a result, the Council would not have needed to consider the impact of any proposals shown on those plans that related to the extension and porch the subject of this appeal.
6. I conclude that discrepancies in the submitted plans make it impossible to adequately assess the impact of the proposed development.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Baljit K Muston

INSPECTOR