
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 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: 08 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/17/3170213

180 Dursley Road, Kidbrooke, London SE3 8PH

- 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 Terry Wilson against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 16/2457/F, dated 28 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. 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

3. The adjacent junction between Dursley Road and Holburne Road has street corners with a distinct form and appearance, a feature that is also found elsewhere nearby. They incorporate open grassed areas which in most cases are planted with a specimen tree. The side boundaries to these public amenity areas are straight and run parallel to the gable end of the neighbouring houses. In contrast, the rear boundary runs diagonally between points that are almost in alignment with the front elevation of the houses. As a consequence, part of the private space to the side of each corner plot house is triangular in shape.
4. The appeal property occupies a prominent corner plot position and is a two storey end of terrace house with a single storey extension at the rear. The street corner has a strong sense of symmetry with the public amenity area and adjoining built form found on the opposite corner of the street. This is an important part of the character and appearance of the locality, as is the simple design of the houses themselves.
5. As noted by the appellant, planning permission has been granted for side extensions at Nos 110, 148 and 171 Dursley Road. However, it is apparent the permitted schemes did not allow for extensions that occupied a large proportion of the triangular shaped space to the side of the houses. An extension also exists at No 163 and it follows the typical form of the permitted

schemes which is for the flank to be straight and parallel to the gable end of the house, thereby leaving the triangular space at the side intact.

6. The proposed single storey side extension would occupy a large portion of the triangular space to the side of the house. The resulting built form would be oddly shaped and complex. Despite the use of matching materials, it would appear awkward and incongruous in the context of the simple design of the house and the lawful side extensions that exist in the area. As it would starkly contrast with the coverage and appearance of the facing single storey side extension to No 171, it would run counter to the important sense of symmetry with the opposite corner of the street.
7. The extension would be set back 0.8m from the front wall of the house and be set in 1m from the boundary. In these respects it would comply with the Council's 'Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document' 2016, (SPD). Nevertheless, at its widest point, it would be close to the width of the existing house and conflict with the SPD's guidance that side extensions should be less than half the width of the main house. It would therefore appear disproportionate to the dimensions of the host dwelling.
8. There is the possible fallback position of a permitted development side extension, as illustrated through the Council's granting of a Certificate of Lawful Development, (Ref: 16/1268/P). However, as that scheme would not be harmful in the terms identified above, it fails to provide justification for the appeal proposal.
9. In light of these findings, it is concluded that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The development would conflict with Policy 7.4 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, these policies require side additions to be of a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality. Owing to its failure to accord with the development plan, the scheme would not constitute sustainable development in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

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

C J Ford

APPOINTED PERSON