



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2022

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9TH May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3293493

1 Crumpsall Street, Abbey Wood, London SE2 0LP

- 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 Miss Bethany Woreboyes against the decision of the Council of the Royal London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref: 21/3583/HD, dated 30 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is double storey side addition and rear double storey addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have determined this appeal based upon the Council's description of development as: "Construction of a part 1, part 2 storey side and rear extension, removal of chimney and alterations to fenestration" as it is a more accurate specification for the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No.1 Crumpsall Street is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling with an original single storey rear extension and a later rear extension with a flat roof. It is located in a residential part of Abbey Wood Road, but close to shops and other facilities at Abbey Wood village.
5. The proposed two storey side extension would be set back from the front wall of the dwelling by around 1 m and set down from the ridgeline by around 0.7 m thereby providing a subordinate appearance when viewed from Crumpsall Street.
6. The proposed rear extension would have flat roofs at ground and first floor levels. There are other examples of flat roofs in the surrounding area. However, because the dwelling is at a corner position at the junction of Crumpsall Road and Abbey Wood Road the proposed flat roofs would appear discordant in relation to the form of the building and particularly in relation to

the first floor extension, would be prominent and out of character in the street scene. The rear extensions would conflict with advice in the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance supplementary planning document, which indicates that flat roofs will be unacceptable where the extension is visible from the public highway and even where not visible from the highway it is preferable that the roof matches that of the original house.

7. The appellant has referred to similar developments previously granted permission at a corner plot at No.1 Greening Street and the end of terrace property of No.2 Smithies Road. However, these permissions were granted in 2017 and 2015 respectively, prior to the publication of the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance supplementary planning document in December 2018. I have determined this appeal based on the individual merits of the proposal and its particular site circumstances having regard to relevant development plan policies and all other material considerations, including the Council's guidance.

Conclusion

8. I conclude that the proposal would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area because of the proposed flat roofs. It would therefore conflict with policy D3 of the London Plan regarding a design led approach. It would also conflict with policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, and with the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance supplementary planning document and the need for residential extensions to respect the scale and character of the host building and the street scene and surrounding area. I have taken all other matters raised into account but conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR