



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2022

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3297942

29 Old Mill Road, London SE18 1QE

- 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 Ms Emily Dickens against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/4435/HD, dated 10 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as the “demolition of existing store and construction of single storey side and rear extension”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are: (i) whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Plumstead Common Conservation Area, and (ii) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 30 Old Mill Road, with particular regard to natural light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property forms part of a terrace of six, 2-storey houses with 2-storey outriggers to the rear. The terrace is opposite Plumstead Common and situated within the Plumstead Common Conservation Area (PCCA). It makes a positive contribution to the PCCA both in respect of the appearance of the street frontage and the pattern of development, namely terraced houses with rear outriggers.
4. The proposal would comprise the erection of a single-storey rear addition that would wrap around the outrigger. In addition to spanning the width of the garden, the proposal would protrude a significant distance beyond both the main rear wall of the house and the rear wall of the outrigger resulting in a substantial increase in the footprint of the house. As a consequence, the proposal would represent a disproportionate addition that would harm the appearance of the property and the terrace, and would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development in the PCCA.
5. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the terrace and would fail to preserve the character

and appearance of the PCCA. It therefore fails to accord with Policies DH1, DH3, DH(a) and DH(h) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan, Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) (RGLP) which seeks development that pays special attention to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas through taking account of the architecture, scale, height, design and pattern of surrounding buildings. The proposal also conflicts with Policies HC1 and D3 of the London Plan (2021) which state that proposals should respond to the existing character of a place and conserve their significance by being sympathetic to the assets' significance.

6. Whilst the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the PCCA, the harm to the significance of the PCCA would be less than substantial. I recognise that the proposal would provide a public benefit in respect of contributing to the local economy during the construction period. However, I do not consider that this benefit would outweigh the harm identified above.

Living Conditions

7. The proposal would result in the formation of a long flank wall along the boundary shared with 30 Old Mill Road, which would be materially taller than the boundary fence it would replace. Due to its height and length this aspect of the proposal would result in a significant reduction in outlook from, and natural light to, the main ground floor rear-facing window in No.30 and significantly enclose a large proportion of the garden area, resulting in oppressive internal and external spaces.
8. For these reasons the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.30. It therefore fails to comply with RGLP Policy DH(b) and the aims of the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018), both of which seek to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers.

Other Matters

9. Details of a recent planning permission for a wrap-around rear addition at 300 Plumstead Common Road (ref: 21/2755/HD) have been provided. I note that this scheme effectively mirrored an existing extension next door and therefore the effects on living conditions described above would not have been a consideration. Whilst No.300 is within the PCCA, its context differs from that at the appeal property and therefore its effects on the PCCA's character and appearance would be different. As such, and given each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits, I attach limited weight to the planning permission for No.300. I also note the rear addition at 25 Old Mill Road, which was granted planning permission in 2005 (ref: 05/1747/F). In my view this exemplifies the level of harm that can result from wrap-around style additions.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole INSPECTOR