



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2023

by S Rawle BA (Hons) Dip TP Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3307101

4 Welton Road, Plumstead, London SE18 2JF

- 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 Michael Ogbemudia against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/2296/F, dated 7 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single-storey rear extension/part 2-storey side extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has submitted a revised plan as part of the appeal process. I consider this would materially change the proposal subject of the original application. Given that interested parties have not had the opportunity to comment on the revisions, I have not had regard to it in determining the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on;
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupants of 6 Welton Road with particular reference to outlook and sense of enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is located in an established residential area of predominantly semi-detached houses of similar age with two common types of elevation design. Properties are set back from the road on a similar building line. Because of the limited space between pairs of semi-detached properties there are few two storey side extensions in the street. The mostly regular spacing between pairs of dwellings and their set back from the road contributes to a pleasant and reasonably spacious streetscene.
5. Although, the appeal property is adjacent to No 2 Welton Road, a corner plot with a more spacious side garden, the detached garage adjacent to the

common boundary with the appeal property continues the rhythm of the spaces between buildings along Welton Road.

6. The proposed two storey side extension would be set down from the existing roof ridge line, but it would not be set back from the front elevation of the house or set in from the common boundary with No 2. As a result, even though matching materials are proposed and the property has a projecting bay window, the extension would not be sufficiently subservient to the host building and would appear as an unacceptably dominant feature in the street scene, particularly when viewed against the limited scale of the garage which would sit immediately adjacent to it and would draw attention to the bulk of the extension.
7. Furthermore, the two-storey addition would extend considerably beyond the rear elevation of the house and the substantial mass of the side elevation of the extension would be prominent in the street because of the adjacent corner site and the mass of the garage. Consequently, the proposal would be apparent in the street scene and due to its scale, bulk, and mass would overwhelm the host property and would be a dominant and incongruous feature that would look harmfully out of place
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London March 2021 (the London Plan), Policies DHI and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies adopted 30 July 2014 (RGLP), which amongst other things seek to achieve high quality design that promotes local distinctiveness, and that extensions should respect the scale and character of the host building, the street scene and the surrounding area.
9. In addition, the proposal would be contrary to the adopted Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which seeks to ensure that side extensions should remain secondary in size and appearance and the original house should remain prominent. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions

10. The rear single storey extension would be set back by a small distance from the common boundary with No 6, but would project from the rear elevation by significantly more than the 3.6 metres recommended in the SPD. Given this depth, and as it would be sited very close to the common boundary, the proposal would result in a substantial block of development with an overall height that would be a considerable margin above the height of the joint boundary fence. The neighbouring property has rear facing windows serving a habitable room next to the boundary and because of the height and projection of the extension the proposal would unacceptably dominate the outlook from the rear facing windows nearest to the joint boundary.
11. Further, the rear extension would be overbearing on the neighbouring garden, it would dominate the garden patio space near to the house and would be detrimental to the living conditions of the residential occupiers of No 6 when using their garden.

12. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupants of 6 Welton Road with particular reference to their outlook and sense of enclosure in conflict with Policy DH(b) of RGLP which seeks to ensure that development respects the living conditions of neighbours including their outlook. It would also conflict with the SPD which sets out that rear extensions should not result in a sense of enclosure.

Other Matters

13. Extensions have been added to other properties in the area, including one at No 5 Welton Road. However, those other properties do not have the same relationship with their surroundings and so their impact is materially different. Therefore, the existence of these other extensions does not justify harmful development on the appeal site.
14. I accept that the extension would allow the appellant to create more living space which would avoid them having to move and buy another property. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
15. The appellant suggests that the proposed single storey rear extension has a height and length which is less than the dimensions that could be applied for under prior approval. However, that is an entirely separate process, I have no details of such a scheme before me and a full and detailed comparison with this case cannot be made. Further, there is no evidence that there would be a real prospect that a prior approval proposal would be pursued.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S Rawle

INSPECTOR