



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019

by Alison Scott BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3230475

9 Leas Dale, Eltham, London SE9 3BZ

- 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 Ion Sirghi against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/1292/HD, dated 6 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: Demolition of existing side structure and construction of storey side rear and front single storey extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal site is listed as 3 Leas Dale on the appeal form although it is clear from the Council's application form that the address is 9 Leas Dale.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the extensions on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a built-up residential area of semi-detached and short terraces of houses. The estate has a uniform appearance to it of two-storey rendered houses with hipped roofs, although alterations have occurred to a number of houses including new porches and changes to the original roof profile. Most of the houses still retain an original single storey structure to the side which is an integral part of their make-up. The property is semi-detached to 11 Leas Dale.
5. The small side structure would be demolished to accommodate a porch to the front that attaches to a new side extension projecting slightly beyond the existing rear building line of the host dwelling. A pitched roof would extend above the front projection only with a flat roof to the remainder. A rear single storey extension is also proposed along the shared boundary with No 11.
6. The Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 advises that side extensions be set

back from the front building line by 0.3m to create a subordinate form of development.

7. The width of the side extension would be approximately 3m wide and would sit forward of the established building line of the host property, its attached neighbour and that of 7 Leas Dale. As a result, it would appear overly prominent within the streetscene as it would not respect the proportions of the main dwelling or the well-established building line pattern along the road that it would sit proud of. The development would therefore not appear subordinate to the host dwelling or respond positively to its environment. The limited expanse of hipped roof to the front would further draw attention to its presence and result in a discordant extension to the host dwelling that would be out of character with the area.
8. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies July 2014, policy DH1 that seeks development to be high quality in design and to positively contribute to its environment by taking account of various criteria including established layout and character, and policy DH(a), which, amongst other criteria, seeks developments to be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality. This general approach to character and placemaking is also echoed within the London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, and I am of the view that the proposal also conflicts in this regard, together with the SPD.
9. I saw from my visit that there are a number of extensions within the immediate area of differing sizes and styles of a modest scale. However, there are no direct examples on a similar property to compare to. In any case, I have assessed the proposal on its own merits.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR