



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2021

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 July 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3271828

6 Sutlej Road, Charlton, SE7 7DB

- 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 Tahir Ahmed against the decision of the Council of The Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/0059/HD dated 5 January 2021 was refused by notice dated 11 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the determination of the application, and the submission of this appeal, a revised National Planning Policy Framework 2021 was adopted on 20 July 2021. Given the main issues for the refusal reason, and the fact the refusal reason does not refer directly to the Framework, it is not considered that this changes or impacts upon the determination of this appeal against the relevant plan.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character of the host building and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling within a residential area. The host property has already undergone alteration with, most notably, a front and side wrap around ground floor extension. The surrounding area is predominantly characterised by relatively uniform pairs of semi-detached dwellings and the spaces between these properties was noted at the time of my site visit. The appeal site is on a wedge shaped plot in that its widest point is off Sutlej Road before narrowing to the rear.
5. The proposed first-floor side extension would extend to the Southern boundary at one point only due to the angle of the property boundary. This is best illustrated on the proposed first floor plan (AHMED/PLAN/002). It does not realistically present visually as right up to the boundary from the street scene. As a result of this, when viewed from the front elevation (mislabelled on the plans), the proposal would be stepped in, and off, the site boundary as well as stepped down notably from the main ridge height. This, combined with the space between the boundary and the built form at the property to the South

- (no. 4a) means I find that the space between dwellings in the appeal street and immediate surrounding locality would be maintained.
6. I find that the existing alterations to the property have, to an extent, already imbalanced the pair of semi-detached properties which the host property is part of. The addition of the first floor side extension alone is modest in itself and would be subordinate, but there would of course be a cumulative effect combining the proposal with the existing extensions. I find that this cumulative effect would exacerbate the existing imbalance to the pair of properties by bringing massing in, at first floor level, in a manner which has ultimately been designed to fit within the site characteristics as a result of plot shape.
 7. There are no examples of similar development along Sutlej Road and, from my site visit, I found that the pairs of semi-detached dwellings along this side of the road were generally well balanced with no additions at first floor level which is a characteristic of the architecture and street scene. I find, therefore, that the design of the proposal within the context of both the character and appearance of the surrounding area would have a negative impact and present as an alien feature. The design is not appropriate to the locality and does not compliment the spatial character of the surrounding buildings.
 8. I note the appellant's submission regarding consent having been granted for a two-storey side extension at No. 7 Sutlej Road (no. 7) in September 2015. I do not, however, have any further details as to the approved scheme before me other than screen shots of approved drawings with the statement. Whilst the proposal may have allowed a two-storey side extension each case must be assessed on its own merits – there is no precedent set.
 9. No. 7 is orientated differently in that it is side on to Sutlej Road. I find that this removes it from being viewed within the more uniform character of the pairs of semi-detached dwellings which are found on the side of the appeal site. This would result in differing impacts as a result of proposals. Notwithstanding this the consent was granted in 2015 and was not implemented. It is not, therefore, characteristic of the area and is of limited weight within this appeal.
 10. The proposal would be contrary to Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 (CS) Policy DH1 which requires developments to provide a positive relationship between the proposed and existing urban context by taking account of the architecture of surrounding buildings and the established spatial character and CS Policy DH(a) which requires that proposals for extensions should be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the locality. The proposal would also be contrary to London Plan 2021 Policy D3 which requires a consideration of design options to determine the most appropriate form of development that responds to a site's context and responds to the existing character of a place and architectural features that contribute to local character.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR