

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 April 2017

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) MCD DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/17/3168669

631 Sidcup Road, Eltham SE9 3AG

- 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 Kevin Dang against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 16/3633/F, dated 1 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is to design and propose a 2 storey side extension with proposed rear extension and proposed loft dormer extension with provision of Juliet balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached house with bay windows to the ground and first floor. The two storey side extension would run from the front to the rear of the house and be of the same ridge height as the existing house. It would also incorporate bay windows to the ground and first floor. The proposal includes a single storey rear extension and an extension to the roof comprising two windows and a door with a Juliet balcony. The dormer extension would have a flat roof and be set just below the ridge of the roof.
4. Core Strategy Policy DH(a)¹ and the Council's SPD² seek to avoid side extensions that could lead to a 'terracing effect', amongst other things. Given the size and design of the extension, such an effect could arise here in conflict with this policy and SPD. The extension would close the open space between the house and the side boundary with No 633 and although there is an existing

¹ Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, Adopted 30 July 2014.

² Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document, July 2016 (SPD).

garage to the side, the proposed two storey extension would reduce that space at first floor level. I consider that the size and design of this side extension would erode this space to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

5. Core Strategy Policy DH(a) requires roof extensions to be designed to respect the scale and character of the host building, the street scene and the surrounding area. The SPD indicates that roof extensions should be proportionate to the size of the original house and dormer extensions should be small scale and the windows should be of an appropriate design considering the other windows in the house. The proposal dormer extension would be large and dominate the house. Its size and design, with its long vertical openings, would have a negative impact on the appearance of the house. It would not respect the scale and character of the host building and therefore would conflict with Policy DH(a) and the SPD.
6. The single storey extension would have less of an impact than the two storey extension and the dormer extension but would add to the overall impact. The proposal as a whole would be disproportionate to the character and appearance of the existing house; it would unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses and be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. This would not achieve the high standard of design required by Policy 7.4 of the London Plan³ and Core Strategy Policy DH1.
7. I note the appellant's reference to other extensions in the area, some of which I saw on my site visit. However, neither these nor any other matter raised alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area contrary to London Plan Policy 7.4, Core Strategy Policies DH1 and DH(a) and the SPD. The appeal therefore fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

³ Mayor of London The London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011, March 2016.