
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 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: 28 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/17/3173273

96 Kentlea Road, Thamesmead, London SE28 0JZ

- 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 & Mrs Mallard against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 16/3981/F, dated 30 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is one and a half storey side extension and single storey rear extension to create larger kitchen, ground floor bedroom and wet room for disabled relative and new bedroom over.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Proposed Section and the Proposed First Floor Plan in drawing AG17640-356 Rev. C are inconsistent. The former shows a kitchen and living room at the first floor level whilst the latter shows a bedroom and ensuite. In the interests of clarity, the appeal has been determined on the basis of the Proposed First Floor Plan which is broadly in accordance with the description of the development on the application form and paragraph 5.16 of the appellant's statement.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a modern housing estate and this part of Kentlea Road is a cul-de-sac which includes a mix of detached, semi-detached and short terraces of two storey houses. Where a built form is found alongside the main part of a house, it is single storey and comprises a garage or carport. Side additions with a first floor level are therefore not a typical feature of the street scene.
5. The appeal property is an end of terrace house with a sizeable space between its flank and the side boundary. The terrace is positioned in such a way that the flank wall of the appeal property is prominent in views from the entrance to the cul-de-sac. The four house terrace is of a modest depth and has largely

- maintained its simple form and appearance. The only notable alteration is the addition of a single storey conservatory at one of the properties.
6. The proposed development would wrap-around the rear corner of the house and the side component would incorporate accommodation at the first floor level. It is acknowledged that the side element would be set well back from the front elevation of the house and it would similarly be set down a good degree from the ridge. Matching materials would also be used. In these respects, it would accord with the Council's 'Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document' 2016 (SPD). However, this would not make the development 'wholly subordinate to the host dwelling and the terrace', as the appellants suggest.
 7. The SPD also specifies that a side extension should be less than half the width of the main house and careful attention must be paid to the position and depth of the extension. It emphasises that extensions need to be in keeping with the original size of the house and not appear bulky.
 8. In terms of its width and positioning, the side element of the extension would significantly exceed half the width of the main part of the house. Nevertheless, the SPD is guidance and it may be applied flexibly having regard to the particular circumstances of a site. In terms of positioning, which is related to the width in this case, an important consideration is whether an appropriate separation distance is maintained with the boundary and neighbouring development so that the extended house sits comfortably within its plot and surroundings.
 9. A path would be provided to the side of the extension but it would narrow towards the rear. As the neighbouring detached garage at No 94 Kentlea Road is positioned directly alongside the boundary, the nearest part of the extended house would stand only a short distance away. Owing to the close proximity to the boundary and the neighbouring garage, the extended house would appear cramped within its plot and surroundings. The width of the extension would therefore be excessive because an appropriate separation distance would not be maintained.
 10. With regard to depth, the rear wall of the first floor to the extension would project beyond the rear wall of the main house and the wider terrace. The depth and high level bulk of this part of the extension would visually dominate the rear of the host property and the terrace. It would also awkwardly contrast with the existing simple form and appearance of the rear elevation.
 11. Likewise, the side of the extension would be prominent in public views from the entrance to the cul-de-sac. Owing to the depth and mass of the first floor towards the rear, it would visually dominate the host property and the terrace. As a whole, including the excessive width, the extension would appear unduly bulky and would not be in keeping with the original size of the house. In a street scene where single storey side additions prevail, its large scale and associated visual appearance would be incongruous.
 12. The personal circumstances of the appellants and the associated benefits the development would bring are acknowledged. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harmful effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the area. Moreover, it is not clear that the proposed scheme is the only possible design solution.

13. The appellants also mention that they intend to remove two existing outbuildings to the rear of the property should the appeal succeed. However, this would not mitigate the harmful effect of the proposed extension on the locality.
14. 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 wider area. The development would thereby conflict with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan 2016 and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014. Amongst other things, these policies require extensions to be of a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality.

Conclusion

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

C J Ford

APPOINTED PERSON