

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2022 by Max Webb BA(Hons)

Decision by O S Woodward BA(Hons.) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3288798
79 Donaldson Road, Plumstead SE18 3JZ

- 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 Sadeck Meyakhan against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/3099/HD, dated 20 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 79 Donaldson Road, Plumstead SE18 3JZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/3099/HD, dated 20 August 2021, 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: the location plan and drawing references DNS02-THO-V1-XX-A-003-P01, XX-A-002-P01, XX-A-005-P01 and ZZ-A-004-P01.
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. I have used the description of the proposed development provided by the Council on the decision notice in favour of that of the original planning application form as it provides a more precise summary of the development proposed.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The proposal is for a large single storey rear extension with a mono-pitched roof. The proposed extension would be constructed on land which slopes downwards away from the existing rear elevation of the house, affording the opportunity to reduce the height of the extension on the rear elevation. The mono-pitched roof would also help to give the proposal a more subordinate appearance. Therefore, despite its depth, it would not dominate the host dwelling.
6. The appeal site is on a street where numerous properties have single storey rear extensions, including a number of properties in the vicinity of the appeal site, such as Nos. 75, 83 and 85 Donaldson Road. There is not an established building line or depth of existing rear extensions, which are in a variety of shapes and sizes. Whilst some of these are of smaller scale than the proposal, there are a number that are similarly sized, and in some cases larger, such as Nos. 71, 73, 91 and 97 Donaldson Road. Because of the variety of existing rear extensions in the area, some of them larger than that proposed, the proposal would be in-keeping with the character of the area.
7. Overall, the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policies DH(a) and DH1 of the Core Strategy¹, which together look to ensure residential extensions are limited to a scale appropriate to the building and locality and provide a positive relationship with the existing urban context. It would also accord with Policy D3 of the London Plan (adopted 2021), which outlines how development proposals should respond to local distinctiveness through their scale. Although the SPD² sets out that a rear extension should not normally project more than 3.6 metres from the rear wall of the original house, it goes on to suggest this is because a deeper extension could block daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties. In terms of the visual impact of an extension, the SPD suggests it should not dominate and should remain subservient. As the proposal would not unacceptably affect neighbouring living conditions and would remain subordinate to the host dwelling, it would comply with the SPD.

Other Matters

8. Concerns have been raised over the building works related to this proposal, including their effect on living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, disposal of construction waste and potential structural damage to neighbouring properties. I have taken all these factors into consideration. However, no substantiated evidence has been provided that there would likely be unacceptable effects in these regards and such issues could be controlled by Building Regulations and other legislation.

Conditions

9. I have recommended the standard time condition for reasons of certainty. For the same reason, I have recommended conditions regarding plans and materials, as well as to ensure an appropriate level of design that protects the character and appearance of the area.

¹ Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (adopted 2014)

² Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (adopted 2018)

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the Development Plan as a whole, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed

O S Woodward

INSPECTOR