
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2017

by G D Jones BSc(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/17/3179330
267 Kingsground, Eltham SE9 5ES

- 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 G Hanson against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 17/0461/F, dated 9 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect that the proposed development would have on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area, and on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, particularly in terms of any 'overbearing impact'.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property forms the end of a terrace of four, two-storey houses which are characteristic of this part of Kingsground and nearby roads, the townscape of which is generally characterised by evenly spaced short terraced rows and semi-detached houses that are largely consistently aligned. The site is located reasonably close to a crossroads formed with The Vista, which features pairs of two-storey semi-detached houses at each corner that are set at an angle to the highway and the neighbouring houses. All of these factors combine to give a pleasant order, balance and rhythm to the street scene.
4. The proposed development would substantially extend the frontage width of the existing house, significantly reducing the characteristic gap between the host terrace and the neighbouring pair of semis at the crossroads, thereby disrupting the marked balance and rhythm described above, both in terms of the host building and the wider street scene.
5. I acknowledge that the overall mass of the proposed extension would be lessened by setting-in the rear elevation from that of the host terrace, thereby reducing the roof ridge, and by the proposed tapered footprint of the extension. The development would also incorporate sympathetic design features found on the host building, such as the low eaves to the front elevation and the pattern of

fenestration. Care could also be taken to ensure that the facing materials used would complement those of the existing building.

6. Nonetheless, for the reasons outlined above and given that the angled side elevation would introduce a design feature that is not clearly present in the local street scene, the appeal scheme would be at odds with and harmful to the character and appearance of the existing building and that of the wider area. Due to its siting close to the junction with The Vista and at an angle to the neighbouring house, No 265, the development would also be reasonably prominent. Consequently, the impact I have described would be significant.
7. Accordingly, in this regard, the proposed extension would conflict with Policies 3.5 (Quality and Design of Housing Development), 7.4 (Local Character) and 7.6 (Architecture) of the London Plan 2016 (the London Plan), Policy DH1 (Design) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy 2014 (the Core Strategy) and the Residential Extensions, Conversions and Basements Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (the SPD).

Living Conditions

8. The proposed development would run immediately adjacent to the side boundary with No 265. A two-storey structure so close to a neighbouring property has the potential to detrimentally affect the living conditions of its occupants. However, in this case, notwithstanding that the properties are set at an angle to each other, the extension would be located to the side of the host terrace and set-in from the principal rear elevation. Consequently, its mass would be largely experienced against the substantial backdrop of the host building, such that its additional effect on the living conditions of the occupants of No 265, including in terms of potentially appearing overbearing, would not be significantly greater than that of the existing building.
9. The proposed extension would not, therefore, have a significant effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents. Consequently, in that respect, it accords with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policies DH(a) (Residential Extensions) and DH(b) (Protection of Amenity for Adjacent Occupiers) of the Core Strategy and the SPD.

Other Matters

10. I note the evidence refers to other development in the area and I have taken this into account in terms of any influence on the character and appearance of the area as discussed above. However, I am not aware of the full circumstances of these other cases and in any event each scheme must be considered and determined on its individual merits. I also note the evidence regarding the personal circumstances of the appellant and his family. While these considerations do weigh in favour of the scheme, given the extent of harm I have identified they are not sufficient to outweigh that harm and the associated development plan policy conflict.

Conclusion

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

G D Jones

INSPECTOR