
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/17/3172488

18 Susan Road, Kidbrooke SE3 0JD

- 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 Miss Irina Sidorenko against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 16/4218/F, dated 20 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as "*the erection of a front porch designed with a yellow stock brick dwarf wall to match the existing building walls and upper UPVC glazed windows and a UPVC door to match existing building windows*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue raised in respect of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey building with single storey wings either side. Centrally within the two-storey part there is a recessed open porch with balcony above. The windows and doors within the front elevation of the building, including that of the single storey wings, are balanced. The four existing windows within the recess are of matching position, sizes and form. Collectively these features give the building a symmetry and uniformity to its appearance. This symmetry has not been undermined by later alterations or changes to the building's frontage.
 4. I observed that other terraced properties in the area have enclosed their front porches but this building is of different character and form to the other developments.
 5. The proposed porch, although a relatively minor development that would not extend beyond the existing envelope of the building, would enclose an area of open porch under the existing first floor balcony and would infill a significant portion of the existing recess at ground level. Erecting a porch within the recess would take away the existing symmetry of the building and would remove the window uniformity within the recess.
-

6. Although the proposed porch would be constructed of matching brickwork and materials to that of the host building and the new porch windows would respect the existing cill and overall heights of the existing windows within the recess, the proposed development would unbalance the overall symmetry of this building and the uniformity to its appearance. This would have a visually detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of this building. This visual harm would be prevalent in public views from the adjoining highway.
7. The appellant has highlighted that the existing side facing front door is, to some extent concealed, and the frosted windows in the existing front door, whilst maintaining privacy for the appellant, prevents identification of visitors. The porch would provide a secondary means of screening visitors and improve security for the appellant when opening the front door. It could also provide some additional storage space and additional thermal insulation for the property. Whilst I sympathise with the personal circumstances of the appellant and her wish to improve security, I am mindful that the harm identified above would be permanent and is not outweighed by the appellant's particular circumstances.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the area. It would be in conflict with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy and Detailed Policies (2014) and the Council's 'Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016). These policies and guidance seek to provide developments of high quality design that positively contribute to the improvement of the built environment, amongst other matters.

Other Matters

9. The appellant suggests that the proposed development would make a minor contribution to mitigating climate change and that the existing window would be recycled. Furthermore, the applicant highlights that there would be no increase in surface water run-off at the appeal site. It is also pointed out that the proposal would not involve demolition, change of land levels, movement of the appellant's boiler and flue and would retain a side facing door and light and ventilation to the kitchen. The proposal would not encroach upon the adjoining occupiers recessed porch area. However, I cannot conclude that the environmental contribution brought about by the proposed development, including that of biodiversity, would be significant in this case or that the other benefits would outweigh the harm identified above or justify the proposed development.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR