



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/20/3252873

54 Sunset Road, Thamesmead, London SE28 8RS

- 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 Mohammed Musa against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0375/HD, dated 31 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is for conversion of the garage into a habitable room and changing the garage door to a window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern 'link detached' house within a relatively recent housing estate. Many of the properties exhibit architectural features including part brick and render facades, gables and garages and as such exhibit a continuity in design and layout that appears intentional and relatively unusual for properties of this type and age.
4. One of these architectural features appears to have been to link house types together through single storey garage elements so as to create a homogenous and characteristic streetscene. This is exhibited particularly well along Sunset Road where houses and garages are interspersed in regular intervals and in such a way as to create a uniform appearance.
5. The contribution of single storey garages is to provide some breaks to the streetscene and create an element of variety and repetition as well as some sense of hierarchy to the road where the garages represent an ancillary element to the houses. Through the loss of the garages I consider that this variety and repetition will be eroded and, even though the single storey linkages will remain, the loss of what appears as a clearly ancillary element to the houses will be lost.

6. As a result the overall design aesthetic of this part of the estate will be harmed. It will moreover result in the increased likelihood of vehicles being parked at all times to the front of the appeal property which, I consider, would further cause visual harm to the streetscene.
7. Although the appellant has directed my attention to other examples of such garage conversions in the local area and I saw on my site visit that there are some other properties nearby which have been modified in a similar manner, I have no information before me as to the reasons or background to these modifications and so I cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same as the case before me. Nonetheless, I do not consider that further such changes would enhance or complement the overriding characteristics of the area.
8. In light of the harm that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the area the proposals would fail to meet the requirements contained within the Framework and policy D3 of the London Plan that seek to achieve a high standard of design. The requirements of policies DH1 or DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan, as well as the guidance contained within the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions SPD that seek to protect the character and appearance of the area are also not met.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR