
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 9 November 2020

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25h November 2020

Appeal A - Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3243533

23 Ennis Road, Plumstead SE18 2QR

- 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 Paul Coley against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 19/3339/HD, dated 28 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension, loft conversion and all associated works.
-

Appeal B - Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3251981

23 Ennis Road, Plumstead SE18 2QR

- 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 Paul Coley against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 19/4367/HD, dated 20 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension, loft conversion and all associated works.
-

Decision – Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Decision – Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for a two storey rear extension, loft conversion and all associated works at 23 Ennis Road, Plumstead SE18 2QR in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 19/4367/HD dated 20 December 2019 subject to the following conditions;
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, 5-5-202, 515-

201, 515-202, 515-203, 515-204, 515-205 REV G, 515-206 REV G, 515-207 REV G, 515-208 REV G, 515-209 REV D & 515-210 REV G.

Procedural Matter

3. The description of the proposals have been altered from the application form to the decision notice. While the latter descriptions do more fully describe the development proposed, I am not aware that the applicant has agreed to the revised descriptions. I am aware of the elements of the proposals that are not fully described. I have therefore considered the appeals on the basis of their original descriptions.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. Situated at the end of a Victorian terrace which climbs Ennis Road, the double fronted appeal property dates from the late 19th Century and has a fine and detailed frontage with a strong vertical emphasis. The rear of the property shares little of the positive characteristics of the front, incorporating pebble dash render and modern window openings. Due to differences in land levels, it is only the first floor and upwards that is visible from Upton Road which arcs up the hill to the rear. Upton Road has a much more modern character incorporating more recent residential property.
6. The Council have not raised objection to either the proposed ground floor extension or increase in height and pitch of the roof and I have no reason to disagree. The main area of disagreement therefore relates to the first floor rear extensions and dormer window.
7. I accept that the first-floor rear extension would not adopt the deft proportions of the main body of the dwelling in favour of a somewhat more modern and bulky form with a large single span of roofslope. However, its form would most readily be read from the more modern Upton Road, from where it would form an unobtrusive feature in relation to the character of this street. It is in this setting, rather than against the rhythmic and largely matching rear outriggers and roofs which fall away down the hill on Ennis Road to the north east of the appeal site that the first floor rear extension would be read.
8. The same argument would apply to the rear dormer window. In relation to design, Policy DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan (2014) (RGLP) requires that roof extensions should be designed to respect the scale and character of the host building, street scene and surrounding area. SPD¹ guidance suggests that dormer extensions should be small scale and the windows should be of an appropriate design considering the other windows in the house. Given the character of the rear street scene and rear elevation of the property taking into account its existing rear openings, the dormer window would not appear out of place. Whilst I accept that it does not incorporate traditional Victorian proportions as depicted in the SPD, it would not be large in scale, being set

¹ Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance December 2018.

well up from the eaves, well in from the side gable and below the revised ridgeline.

9. The proposal under appeal B, even when all elements are considered together, would therefore not have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would comply with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the RGLP, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and SPD guidance which require amongst other things well designed proposals which are sympathetic to local character.
10. The scheme under appeal A includes a mixed flat and pitched roof design to the rear extension which would include windows of an excessively horizontal appearance. The overall design of the first-floor extension under this appeal would have an unresolved appearance which would lead to it forming an incongruous feature that would be highly visible from Upton Road. It would not form the well-designed extension that is sought and would as a result fail to comply with the planning policy and guidance detailed above.

Conditions

11. In relation to appeal B, planning permission is granted subject to the standard three-year time limit. Matching materials are required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. It is necessary that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that appeal A should be dismissed and appeal B should be allowed subject to the conditions.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR