



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2019

**by Euan FS Pearson BA(Hons) BTP FRGS MRICS MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 13<sup>th</sup> August 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/18/3217590**

**149 Mayday Gardens, Kidbrooke London SE3 8NP**

- 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 Davoud Shirzay against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
  - The application Ref 18/3046/HD, dated 22 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2018.
  - The development proposed is construction of a part 1/part 2 storey rear extension, first floor side extension and single storey front extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. I note that there is a difference between the description in the application form and that used by the Council in its decision notice. I have considered the appeal on the basis of the description shown in the Council's decision notice, as used on the appeal form, as this more precisely describes the appeal proposal.
3. I observed during my site visit that the rear extension (Prior Notification Ref 18/2214/PN1) was substantially complete. There is a further single storey side extension, not shown on the Notification drawings. I have taken this development into account when considering the appeal.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the area surrounding the appeal site.

### Reasons

5. The appeal property is one of a pair of two storey semi-detached dwellinghouses (149-151 Mayday Gardens) with a ground floor rear extension, about 6m deep across its width, and a full width rear roof dormer, almost completely glazed. Directly behind are playing fields with views of the appeal property.

6. It is proposed to widen the rear extension, to the boundary with 147 Mayday Gardens, thus lengthening the side extension. The side extension would also be built out, so as to align with the porch facing the street. In addition, a part first floor would be added above the side extension and to the north western quadrant of the rear extension.
7. Increasing the size of the ground floor extensions would result in a very significant enlargement of the footprint of the original dwellinghouse. This, taken with the existing roof dormer and proposed addition of first floor accommodation with pitched roof, to the side and rear, would not give the appearance of diminutive physical extensions.
8. The proposal would produce a two storey extension along the boundary with No 147, in the gap between the two, contributing to a terracing effect. I consider that a side extension, at this height, for a length of approximately 11m, in such close proximity, would appear bulky and incongruous and would have the effect of detracting from the general balance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties. Bringing forward the front building line of the side extension, to meet the porch would add emphasise to this effect.
9. For the collective reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed extensions by virtue of their overall size, position and height would have a significantly detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area and the host property.
10. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with London Plan 2016 policies 7.4 and 7.6; policies DH1 and DH(a) of Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014; Section 5 of the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016; and the National Planning Policy Framework which, amongst other things, require a high quality of design that is appropriate and makes a positive contribution to the locality.

### **Other Matters**

11. The appellant has submitted various photographs of paired properties with two storey side extensions. It is not in dispute that there are examples in other parts of Mayday Gardens, and some pairs have become unbalanced. I have taken this into account. The presence of very large extensions is not, however, widespread and does not change my conclusion on the main issue.

### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Euan FS Pearson*

INSPECTOR