
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2021

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3263281

22 Crosier Close, Kidbrooke, Greenwich, SE3 8NT

- 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 Neelkamal Irvine against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 20/2048/HD, dated 31 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single-storey rear extension at 22 Crosier Close, Kidbrooke, Greenwich, SE3 8NT in accordance with the terms of the application, 20/2048/HD, dated 31 June 2020, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drg Nos BDS2008 Sheet 1 Rev B, BDS2008 Sheet 2, BDS2008 Sheet 3, BDS2008 Sheet 4 and BDS2008 Sheet 5 Rev B.
 - 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. Since the date of the decision The London Plan 2021 (LP 2021) was published on 1 March 2021 and is now part of the development plan. The Council's decision notice referred to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2016 (LP 2016), which are now superseded. The main parties for the appeal were invited to express their views on the LP 2021 insofar as it relates to the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 22 Crosier Close and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a modern detached, two-storey house with accommodation arranged over three floors, of traditional appearance and located within a gated, private residential estate comprising a mix of property types, all appearing to be constructed as part of the same development. The proposal is for a single-storey, flat roofed rear extension.
5. The Council's *Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018* (SPD), when dealing with single-storey rear extensions, states that it is important for this type of extension to not dominate and for it to remain subservient to the original house. It goes on to state that they should not normally project out more than 3.6m from the rear wall of the original house (if the house is attached) as a deeper extension could block daylight and sunlight for neighbouring properties. I have not been directed to any other guidelines within the SPD relating to the depth of single-storey extensions for detached properties.
6. The proposed extension would project beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling by just over 5.2m. It would span approximately two-thirds the width of the rear elevation with a chamfered flank wall roughly central to the site. The Council is concerned that due to its size and appearance the extension would fail to appear subordinate to the host dwelling and therefore would be out of keeping with the area.
7. The extension would be fairly large. However, it would be appropriately residential in scale and form, and to my mind would relate comfortably to the size of the original dwelling without appearing dominant or out of proportion. The plot is of a sufficient size to accommodate the extension. It would appear neither cramped nor out of keeping within the context of its rear garden setting. The dwelling would appear unchanged within the street scene when viewed from within Crosier Close and as such I cannot agree with the Council's assessment that the appeal proposal would somehow be out of keeping with the streetscape. The chamfered side elevation may not be typical for a rear extension but it would be within an enclosed setting and would merely offer a contemporary alternative approach that would have no visual impact beyond the confines of the rear garden. Whilst other properties in Crosier Close may not have been extended to such a depth, this does not preclude the erection of an extension that in my assessment would be respectful of the scale and character of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
8. Overall, I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of 22 Crosier Close or the surrounding area. As such, I find no conflict with Policy DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014), which requires residential extensions to be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality, or with Policy DH1, which more generally requires high quality design in all developments. I also find no conflict with LP 2021 Policy D3, which has been drawn to my attention by the Council since the appeal was made as a relevant replacement for LP 2016 Policies 7.4 and 7.6. This requires development proposals to respond positively to local distinctiveness through, amongst other things, their scale, appearance, and shape.

Conditions

9. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to control the external materials to be used.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR