



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2019

by S A Whitehead LLB (Hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3229511

92 Briset Road, Eltham SE9 6LQ

- 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 A Chen against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/0451/HD, dated 7 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a part one/part two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a part one/part two storey side extension at 92 Briset Road, Eltham SE9 6LQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/0451/HD, dated 7 February 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: 18025AC-PP-16 Block Plan, 18025AC-PP-15 Site Location Plan, 18025AC-PP-08 Proposed Ground Floor, 18025AC-PP-09 Proposed First Floor, 18025AC-PP-10 Proposed North Elevation, 18025AC-PP-11 Proposed East Elevation, 18025AC-PP-12 Proposed South Elevation, 18025AC-PP-13 Proposed West Elevation, 18025AC-PP-14 Proposed Roof Plan.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the first floor window to the side elevation of the extension as depicted on Drawing No. 18025AC-PP-10 Proposed North Elevation has been fitted with obscure glazing and once installed the obscure glazing shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council altered the description of the development from 'Two storey side extension' to 'Construction of a part one/part two storey side extension.' This is also the description used by the appellant on the appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposal and I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

3. I have used the address provided on the application form although I note that it is expressed differently on the appeal form.
4. I have taken the appellant's name from the application form although I note that a Christian name has been provided on the appeal form.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene of Briset Road.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling that appears to date from the mid 20th century. A mixture of semi-detached and terraced dwellings of similar form and appearance continue southwards along Briset Road. Besides being of similar form and appearance to the appeal property, these dwellings are also similarly set back some distance from the road, and a building line is evident.
7. Whilst it resembles the residential development to the south in terms of its form, appearance and set back from the road, the appeal property and its attached neighbour, No. 90, stand slightly apart from the rest of the properties along this section of Briset Road, being situated to the north of a junction serving Lynsted Gardens. The appeal property is also unusual, having a wider plot than the vast majority of dwellings along Briset Road.
8. It is also of note that the land immediately adjoining the appeal property to the north has been recently redeveloped with a mixture of two and three storey residential properties. The building closest to the appeal site comprises a three storey block that appears to be subdivided into flats. Besides being of greater height than the appeal property, it is notable that this three storey block does not reflect the building line evident along Briset Road to the south, being sited closer to the road.
9. The forward siting of this building thus screens the appeal property from view when approaching it from the north-west along Briset Road. In views gained from the south-east, the appeal property is viewed against a backdrop of the taller, forward-sited three storey building, which has a greater presence in the street scene and draws the eye.
10. The proposed extension would feature a hipped roof matching the main roof of the host property, and the front wall of the extension would be articulated and set back from the front wall at first floor. This set back would also result in the articulation of the extension's roof, reducing its ridge height below that of the main roof of the host property. Whilst the ground floor of the extension would not be set back in this way and would extend the entire depth of the property's side elevation, I find that the set back at first floor level would be sufficient to ensure that the extension would appear subordinate and sympathetic to the proportions of the host property and would not result in a visual imbalance to the pair of semi-detached dwellings. The extension's facing materials too would relate to those used in the host building. In these respects, the extension would be sympathetic to the host building, and comply with the guidance contained in the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (SPD).

11. In addition to my findings above, I am conscious that the appeal property has limited presence in the street scene, having regard to the more substantial and prominently sited flatted development now constructed adjacent to it. The appeal property also benefits from an unusually wide plot in relation to other similar properties in Briset Road, and would comfortably accommodate the proposed extension without it appearing cramped. For all these reasons the proposal would not appear at odds with the prevailing pattern of development in the vicinity or harmful to the character of the host property and wider street scene.
12. I appreciate that the proposal would be contrary to the Council's SPD insofar as the ground floor of the extension would extend the entire depth of the host property, and would not be set back beyond the main front wall, and insofar as its width would, at ground floor, exceed half the width of the host property. However, these technical breaches of the Council's guidance do not in themselves make the proposal unacceptable having regard to the circumstances of this case.
13. Therefore, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the street scene of Briset Road. As such it would accord with policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014. These policies require all new development to achieve high quality design, to positively contribute to the improvement of the built environment taking account of the scale, height, bulk and massing of the adjacent townscape, and be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality. It would also comply with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2016 which have similar aims in relation to local character generally.

Conclusion

14. Having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted subject to conditions that are necessary in the interests of certainty and to safeguard the living conditions of the occupants of the adjoining residences to the immediate north of the appeal site.

Sandra Whitehead

INSPECTOR