



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2023

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3311747

75 Swingate Lane, Plumstead, Greenwich SE18 2DB

- 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 Jacob Izzi against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/2451/HD, dated 9 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appealing dwelling is a two storey palisaded end of terrace house, with a two storey rear outrigger and a narrow rear garden. It is located near to the junction of Swingate Lane with Bassant Road, on a street made up of similar properties. Its rear and flank wall face on to the grounds of Rockliffe Manor Primary School.
4. The appeal dwelling appears to be a House in Multiple Occupation in C4 use and has been the subject of two flat roofed ground floor rear extensions. One of these is to the rear and same width as the rear outrigger. The second is to the side and to the same depth as the outrigger and extends to the side boundary of the appeal dwelling with the grounds of the primary school. The proposal is for a flat roofed first floor extension that would be above and to the full extent of this second extension.
5. The proposal would extend the existing first floor rear bedroom in the outrigger. The flat roof of the proposal would appear to join with the existing mono-pitched roof of the outrigger just above the eaves line. The proposal would also require the partial infill of an existing window opening in the rear main wall of the appeal dwelling. The window in the rear wall of the proposed extension would reflect the positioning and design of the existing first floor window in the rear of the outrigger.

6. The design of the flat roof form, depth and bulk of the proposal is not informed by the form of the existing house and would appear as being in contrast to the pitched roofs and existing scale of the appeal dwelling. The junction of the flat roof of the proposed extension with the mono-pitched roof of the outrigger would appear as a misalignment and an unresolved piece of design, which would not reflect the existing architectural detailing of the appeal dwelling. This would result in an architecturally incoherent relationship between the proposal and the outrigger.
7. This incoherent design, combined with the bulk of the of the proposal would result in massing that would fail to reflect the scale of the appeal dwelling, thereby causing the proposal to dominate its rear and to appear unduly prominent. As such, the proposal would appear as an incongruous addition to the appeal dwelling.
8. This would be apparent in views of the flank and rear of the appeal dwelling from neighbouring properties, including the grounds of the primary school. It would also be apparent in views of the flank and rear of the appeal property from Bassant Road. In these views the proposed first floor extension would not conform to the arrangement of the terraced houses and their outriggers, which form the rear architectural expression of the terrace, and would not, therefore, appear as a complementary addition to the streetscene of the local area.
9. For these reasons, the proposal would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area. This would not accord with the guidance given in Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018), and would be contrary to policies DH1, DH(a) of the of Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions, demonstrate high quality design, respond to context, and integrate with the local area.
10. The appellant has argued that the proposal would assist in boosting local housing. However, the proposal would not increase local housing provision, but would rather extend the size of a single bedroom in an existing dwelling. Whilst the proposal would result in a larger dwelling with additional living space, the benefits of the proposal are primarily of a private nature and I have, therefore, only afforded this limited weight in my considerations. These benefits do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

11. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR