



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2022

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3303325

11 Sutcliffe Road, Greenwich, Plumstead, London SE18 2NF

- 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 C Davis against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
- The application Ref 22/1416/HD, dated 6 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2022.
- The development proposed is a ground floor side extension, alterations to ground floor rear extension, alterations to fenestration and construction of first floor rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor side extension, alterations to ground floor rear extension, alterations to fenestration and construction of first floor rear extension at 11 Sutcliffe Road, Greenwich, Plumstead, London SE18 2NF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/1416/HD, dated 6 May 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Ground Floor Plan – Option 08 Drawing Number PP-01 Rev P1; Proposed First Floor, Drawing Number PP-02 Rev P1; Proposed Roof Plan, Drawing Number PP-03 Rev P1; Proposed Rear Elevation & Section BB, Drawing Number PP-04 Rev P1; Proposed Side Elevation, Drawing Number PP-05 Rev P1; Proposed Section AA, Drawing Number PP-06 Rev P1; Proposed Section CC, Drawing Number PP-07 Rev P1.
 - 3) The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall be as indicated on the approved plans and application form. All new works and works of making good to the retained fabric shall be finished to match the adjacent work unless otherwise stated on the approved drawings and retained for the lifetime of the development.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), the use of the flat roofed extension hereby approved shall be as set out in the application and no development or the formation of any door providing access to the roof shall be carried out, nor shall the roof area be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Ms C Davis against the Royal Borough of Greenwich. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, including the setting of Plumstead Common Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling. It is located in a street of similar properties that, from the front, are relatively uniform in appearance and are not particularly notable for their architectural detail. The property has an existing single storey rear offshoot. This is characteristic of the rear of the surrounding properties I was able to observe on my site visit, where there is a range of, primarily single storey, rear extensions.
5. The proposed development would mainly comprise a single storey rear extension but would also include a smaller two storey section that would be closest to the main part of the dwelling. It would be clad in timber. Due to its siting at the rear of the property, there would be minimal views of the extension from public vantage points, and those that would be permissible would be across the rather haphazard and somewhat unsightly appearance of the adjacent commercial unit.
6. In terms of its size and siting, the development would be a relatively modest addition to the property with the ground floor section being largely in place of the existing offshoot. The first-floor section would somewhat depart from the prevailing form of the surrounding properties with single storey extensions, however, due to it constituting a relatively small addition, it would not dominate the property, and I do not find harm would be caused in this regard. The appellant has also highlighted examples in the street of similar first floor rear extensions.
7. The extension is proposed to be clad in timber. This would unashamedly not match with the external materials of the host property. I acknowledge that it is commonplace for domestic extensions to be constructed from materials to match the host dwelling, however in this instance the clear division in materials does not automatically lead me to the conclusion that matching materials are required, particularly in light of the limited views from the public realm.
8. I find that the use of timber in this context would sit comfortably and complement the prevalence of timber used in the rear garden and its outbuildings. The appellant has also provided examples of the successful use of timber in domestic extensions, which serves to demonstrate is not a wholly inappropriate material. I therefore find no reason why timber may not be used in the proposed extension of this design and in this context. This is despite a minor conflict with the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2018) which outlines that materials should be related as closely as possible to those used in the original building, whilst acknowledging that the use of different materials may, in certain circumstances, be acceptable.
9. Although a flat roof is proposed which would be in contrast to the pitched roof of the main part of the dwelling, the distinctive design of the extension does

not warrant a replication of the roof style of the main part of the dwelling in this instance. This would conflict with the SPD which discourages the use of flat roofs, however for the reasons given, I do not find harm from the use of a flat roof in this instance. There would also be minor conflict with the requirement of Policy DH(a) that flat roofs visible from the public highway are not acceptable, although due to its scale and siting, the visibility from the public highway would be very limited, and in its context, as outlined above, not unacceptable overall.

10. At the rear, the appeal property abuts the boundary of the Plumstead Common Conservation Area (PCCA). The PCCA is predominantly formed by Plumstead Common and the properties on its periphery, including those on The Slade, directly to the rear of the appeal property. Although the extension would be visible from the rear of the properties on The Slade, and some glimpsed views from within the PCCA, these would be at some distance. And given its overall size and scale, combined with the lack of harm I have identified above, I do not consider that the proposed development would harm the setting of the PCCA.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area, nor would there be harm caused to the setting of the PCCA. It would comply with Policies DH1, DH(a) and DH(h) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021). These policies require, amongst other things, that development is of high-quality design, residential extensions be of an appropriate scale and design, and development does not harm the setting of conservation areas.
12. Although there would be minor conflict with the SPD in relation to materials and the use of a flat roof, the proposed development would comply with the broader aims of the SPD that extensions should be in keeping with the size of the original house and not appear bulky to ensure that the extension would have as little impact as possible on the character of the house, neighbouring properties, and the street scene.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.
14. In the interests of character and appearance, it is necessary to impose a condition requiring the use of the specified materials and the making good of retained fabric. In the interests of the living conditions of occupants of surrounding properties with regard to privacy, a condition preventing the use of the flat roofed part of the extension as a balcony, roof garden or similar, is necessary.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR