



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2019

by D Jackman BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3231708
110 Tunnel Avenue, Greenwich SE10 0SD

- 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 Siddharth Ankathil against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/1031/HD, dated 16 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of the existing conservatory and garage. Erection of a single storey rear and side extension. Proposed entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear and side extension, and proposed entrance porch at 110 Tunnel Avenue, Greenwich SE10 0SD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/1031/HD, dated 16 March 2019, and the plans submitted with it, 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 accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No: 19-010-004 Revision 02; Drawing No: 19-010-005 Revision 02 and Drawing No: 19-010-006 Revision 02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the proposed rear extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of 108 Tunnel Avenue, with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace house. The single storey rear and side extension, the subject of this appeal, would align with the front building line of the dwelling and 'wrap around' the property to project about 6 metres to the rear. The entrance porch would adjoin the front bay.
4. Several properties in the locality have single storey side extensions which align with the front of the house and/ or entrance porches which adjoin the front bay, so they are common characteristics in the locality.
5. The Council argues that the excessive depth and width of the proposed extension would appear disproportionate to the original property. As such it would not appear sub-ordinate in scale or appearance and would be out of character with the prevailing pattern of development. Further, the proposed side extension would be visible for its full length and would be obtrusive within the streetscape.
6. The unattached neighbouring dwelling, at 112 Tunnel Avenue, is set further back into its site than the appeal property. The 2 garages attached to the side of 112 Tunnel Avenue are further set back. Due to this relationship much of the proposed side extension would be visible from the street. However, that said, it would be of a single storey height and as it would be seen in the context of other 2-storey dwellings, it would not form a prominent feature in the street-scene. Furthermore, it would not have an excessive width, being very similar in width to several side extensions in the locality. For these reasons, I consider that it would be subordinate to the host property.
7. Notwithstanding whether planning permission was granted or not, many of the properties on Tunnel Avenue have porches adjoining their front bay which are similar to that proposed. Furthermore, as the porch would be single storey, it would not dominate the 2-storey bay. I therefore consider that the porch would look appropriate to the host dwelling and would not be out of character with the wider street-scene.
8. I appreciate that the proposal would not fully comply with the Council's Residential Extensions, Conversions and Basements Supplementary Planning Document (2016) insofar as the size of the side and rear extension exceeds that recommended, the side extension is not set back from the front of the house and the porch is attached to the bay window. However, these breaches of the Council's guidance do not in themselves make the proposal unacceptable having regard to the circumstances of this appeal.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposed development would be in accordance with the aims of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) (LP) as well as policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) (CS). Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that developments are a high quality design, and respect the scale and character of the building and street scene.

Living Conditions

10. The Council state that the proposed rear extension would project 6m deep along the boundary shared with no. 108 Tunnel Avenue, whilst the proposed floor plans indicate a future extension to no 108. At the time of my site visit, a single storey rear extension with mono pitched roof which extends about 4 metres from the rear wall, across part of the width of the property, had been constructed at no 108. The flank wall of the extension is set marginally off the boundary with the appeal property.
11. The single storey rear extension, subject to this appeal, would project about 2 metres beyond the rear of the extension at 108 Tunnel Avenue. Given this relatively modest projection, and the pitched roof over the rearmost section, the proposed extension would not materially affect the living conditions of the occupiers of no 108. It would not have a significant effect on the outlook from either the adjoining rear patio door or the garden, nor would it be overbearing or create a sense of enclosure.
12. Accordingly the proposed development would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupants of 108 Tunnel Avenue and would not conflict with the objectives of policy 7.6 of the LP or policy DH(b) of the CS which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that extensions do not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers.

Planning Conditions

13. I have attached the standard time limit condition and, in the interests of certainty, it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. A condition requiring materials to match those existing is necessary to ensure that the development has a suitable appearance.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

D Jackman

INSPECTOR