
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2017

by D Guiver LLB(Hons) Solicitor

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

Decision date: 05th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/17/3168732
26 Charlton Dene, Charlton SE7 7BZ

- 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 Halil Behcet against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 16/3346/F, dated 10 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single-storey front, two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area; and the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring property at 24 Charlton Dene.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. Charlton Dene is a residential area of modest inter-war dwellings built predominantly in short terraces of between four and six houses, and set back from the street in relatively large plots. In addition there are a number of pairs of semi-detached properties, mainly on the southern side of the street where it intersects with other residential streets. These semi-detached properties are built at an oblique angle to the street so that one house is in Charlton Dene and the other in the intersecting road. The appeal site is one of the semi-detached properties with its twin sitting in Grenada Road. These semi-detached properties sit in roughly triangular plots.
 4. The proposed development would increase the width of the host building's front elevation by approximately 40 percent on both ground and first floors. On the first floor the extension would sit back slightly from the front elevation and would be flush with the rear elevation. However, on the ground floor the extension would incorporate an enlarged front porch and would stand approximately a metre proud of the current front elevation. As a consequence, the overall massing of the extension would be deeper than the existing building.
-

5. The roof of the extension would be lower than the existing roof by approximately half a metre. Despite the marginally lower roof, the projection of the extension at ground-floor level and the overall scale of the extension would result in the development being a dominant and incongruous addition to the host building.
6. Because of its position on the corner and oblique orientation, the extension would be immediately noticeable and would extinguish the existing symmetry of the semi-detached pair. An unbalanced semi-detached pair would sit uncomfortably with the remaining pairs, especially the pair sitting directly across the junction with Grenada Road on the opposite corner. The scale and location of the extension would have a significant detrimental effect on the existing spatial and built pattern of the area.
7. The appellant has referred to an extension to a nearby property at 1 Nigeria Road, which received planning permission. No 1 is a semi-detached property occupying a corner plot, similar to the appeal site. However, the extension at No 1 is a single storey and sits well back from the front elevation of the building. I consider the two schemes to be so significantly different they are not comparable, and therefore I attach little weight to the grant of planning permission for the extension at No 1.
8. For the reasons above, I conclude that the development would not be in accordance with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and Policy DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 (the Local Plan) that amongst other things seek to ensure that the scale of a development respects the scale and character of the host building and the surrounding area. The development would also not be in accordance with Policy DH1 of the Local Plan, which seeks to ensure buildings take account of the established layout and spatial character of an area.

Living Conditions

9. The extension would result in the north-eastern side elevation of the building sitting closer to the boundary with 24 Charlton Dene. The orientation of the existing building is such that the proposed development would extend towards No 24's front corner. The rear elevation of the extension would face the side elevation at No 24, which would block all but one small area of No 24's rear garden from view. The area of No 24's garden that would be visible can already be viewed from the existing first-floor rear bedroom window at the appeal site.
10. The first-floor window in the side elevation of No 24 appears to serve a bathroom and it sits to the south of the area where the proposed extension would be built. Therefore, the extension would not result in any loss of privacy to habitable rooms or loss of light for the occupiers of No 24. The extension would be visible from the front and rear gardens at No 24, but to a very limited extent that I consider would not result in any sense of overbearing.
11. I consider that the proposed extension would not result in an unacceptable detrimental effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 24. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would be in accordance with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan and Policies DH(a) and DH(b) of the Local Plan that, amongst other things, seek to ensure that developments do not cause overbearing or an unacceptable loss of privacy. However, the acceptable effect

of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 24 is not sufficient to outweigh the significant harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area and to the host building.

Other Matters

12. The appellant states that the development would provide for a greater housing mix and larger accommodation for himself and his family, and thereby improve the conditions in which they live. The need for appropriate housing for families is an important material consideration to which I give significant weight and while the development would not increase housing stock it would increase the number of habitable rooms available. However, the modest benefits for the appellant and his family are not sufficient to outweigh the significant harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area and to the host building.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons stated above, and taking into account all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Guiver

INSPECTOR