The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2017

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP Dist. MRTPI

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 12 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/17/3171101
14 The Vista, Eltham, London SE9 5RQ

- 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 Mrs Vera Ilir against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
- The application Ref 16/4054/F, dated 1 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2017.
- The development proposed is double storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. At the site visit it was noted that a sizeable single storey flat roof side extension had recently been constructed at the appeal property. The extension is not shown on the submitted plans.

Main issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is part of a formally planned area which in its layout and design is based on the spatial characteristics of a garden suburb. This is reflected in the siting of the host property which stands alongside the entrance to a small green that is set back from the main road section of The Vista.

5. The green has a perimeter footpath and is enclosed on each side and at the rear by short rows of terrace houses. In contrast, the appeal property is semi-detached and it is mirrored by another pair of semi-detached properties located on the opposite side of the entrance to the green. As a consequence, when the green is viewed from the main road section of The Vista, it is framed by a built form which has a visually pleasing degree of symmetry. This symmetry is an important part of the character and appearance of the locality.

6. Of similar importance is the manner in which the building lines of the terrace properties that front the green are set back a short distance from the perimeter footpath. This creates a sense of spaciousness around the green. Although the side elevations of the appeal property and the property opposite are set back to a lesser degree, their positioning nevertheless adds to the sense of

spaciousness. The recent side extension has impinged on this spaciousness at the ground floor level.

7. Whilst the ridge height of the proposed extension would be set down a little from that of the existing house, it would match the proportions of the gable end elevation in other respects and have a large hipped roof front facing dormer. It would therefore be a bulky addition and fail to appear suitably subservient to the host building. The dormer's positioning, scale and design is not a characteristic feature of properties in the locality and it would appear incongruous.

8. The attached neighbouring property does not benefit from a two storey side extension, nor does the pair of semi-detached properties located opposite. The proposal would therefore result in the host property and its attached neighbour becoming unduly unbalanced as a pair. The visually pleasing degree of symmetry at the entrance to the green would also be undermined and the sense of spaciousness around the green would be further eroded at the more prominent first floor and roof levels.

9. In light of these findings, the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The identified harm is not outweighed by the benefit of providing additional living accommodation at an existing family home.

10. The development would conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) as well as Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Council's Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014). Amongst other things, the policies require proposals for side additions to be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality. They also expect developments to provide a positive relationship between the proposed and existing urban context by taking account of the established layout and spatial character.

11. The development would similarly conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document `Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance' (2016). It specifies that all new residential extensions should be sensitive to the original building and respect the street scene and character of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C J Ford

APPOINTED PERSON