

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2017

by A A Phillips BA(Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: Friday, 13 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/16/3161223

50 Abergeldie Road, Eltham SE12 8BJ

- 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 Caroline Smith against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 16/1842/F, dated 10 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is construction of a two storey side extension to provide additional living space at ground floor level and two bedrooms at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the area generally.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey pitched roof detached property which occupies a prominent plot located adjacent to the junction of Abergeldie Road and Crathie Road. It is within a predominantly residential area of Eltham where there is a mix of similar period detached and semi-detached properties, some of which have been extended and altered in various ways in the past.
 4. The extension, by virtue of its bulk, scale, massing and design at the corner location and slightly elevated position in relation to the approach to the site from Crathie Road, would be clearly visible and conspicuous above the boundary fence and mature high hedge. The existing boundary treatment would provide screening for a large part of the proposed ground floor from close distance. However, from longer distance views the first floor flat roofed addition would be seen as a dominant and bulky development at odds with its surroundings.
 5. Although the property is set within a relatively large plot and there would be some separation between the extension and the adjacent road it would not sit comfortably within the site against the host property.
 6. The proposed two storey side extension has been designed as an individual contemporary addition to the existing traditional detached property which is
-

currently constructed of brick with a pitched tile roof. The proposed flat roof extension with full height glazed slot at the junction of the existing house and the extension and the proposed materials of zinc cladding panels, powder coated aluminium cappings and extensive glazing would contrast with the existing building.

7. Although I accept that the approach of adding a modern extension to a more traditionally designed building may be suitable in some cases, the contrast in this case is stark. Therefore, as a consequence of its form, design, materials and detailing the development would be incongruous and would fail to harmonise with the original dwelling and the established character of the surrounding residential area.
8. The appellant contends that the proposed extension compares favourably with a previously approved extension to the property. However, I have not been provided with the full details of the previous proposal and cannot make a direct comparison. I also note that the previous proposal will have been assessed under a different planning policy regime; the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies July 2014 (the CS) having been adopted and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) introduced since 2011. Furthermore, I do not have the full details of the circumstances that led to that development being granted planning permission. In any case I am required to consider each case on its own merits.
9. The appellant also refers to other examples of extensions and alterations being allowed near to the site, which I observed at my site visit. However, other examples do not share the same site specific circumstances of the current appeal site nor are the other examples comparable in terms of scale, design and impact.
10. Therefore, the development would have an unacceptable harmful effect on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the area generally and would conflict with the design requirements of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2015), which seek to ensure that development has regard to local character and makes a positive contribution to the street scene. It would also conflict with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the CS, the Council's Advice Note 2 'Planning Guidance for Home Extensions' January 2004 and the Framework, which require residential extensions to be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality, to demonstrate that they positively contribute to improving the built environment and relate well to their surroundings.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons and taking account of other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR