



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2019

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/19/3235939

6 Anstridge Road, Avery Hill, London SE9 2LJ

- 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 Nian Xin Zheng against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 19/1709/F, dated 8 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the "construction of a 2 storey side extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Anstridge Road lies within a planned, ordered and cohesive residential estate, typified by terraces of varying lengths and semi-detached houses of a generally consistent appearance within groups, featuring strong and consistent building-lines. The appeal site itself is at the end of a terrace of four properties, with a symmetrical, balanced appearance, arranged around a short cul-de-sac with two other similar terraces. As the appeal site lies at the end of the terrace and on a junction, it has a large side garden, tapering to the rear. The relationship between the appeal property and its corner neighbour is consistent with both the opposite side of this cul-de-sac and another further along Anstridge Road. The formal approach to layout, building-lines, corners and junctions is consistent throughout the estate.
4. The appeal proposal would, by virtue of its width unbalance both the terrace which it extends, and the careful symmetry and balance of the cul-de-sac which it faces. The proposal would appear incongruously large and uncharacteristically close to the neighbouring corner property. In my view, the effect of the proposal would be heightened by its corner location and increased prominence in the street-scene as a result. The proposal would disrupt the established, consistent pattern and character of the estate which has remained in the face of various alterations, single storey extensions, outbuildings and differing approaches to boundary treatments. It would therefore cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The appellant has drawn my attention to a similar development nearby at 122A Restons Crescent which they use to support their case, and I saw it on my site visit. I accept that it is larger than the appeal proposal and that it does not feature the step-down in the roof proposed here. However, that part of Restons Crescent has a different character, with a less symmetrical appearance and a different approach to the adjacent junction than the appeal site and its surroundings.
6. I accept that the ridge line of the appeal proposal is set down from the original dwelling, the proposed use of matching materials, energy efficient means of construction and insulation and that there are no impacts on neighbouring amenity. I note the comments of the appellants concerning natural surveillance, security and their desire to provide better and improved living space. I also note that there are a number of single storey side extensions in the area which have not harmed the character or appearance of the area.
7. I note the comments of the appellant regarding the consistency of the appeal proposal with the Residential Extensions, Basement and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document July 2016 (the SPD). However, the general guidance it contains is set against an overarching aim to balance development proposals against protection of the character of the house being extended and the local area. The SPD also highlights the potential for side extensions to impact the character of a street particularly on corner plots and seeks to avoid the loss of open character between properties. It also specifically notes that proposals will be considered against the development plan and the individual circumstances of each case.
8. However, none of the above changes my conclusion that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, owing to its size, relationship to neighbouring properties and overall effect on the street-scene.
9. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Details Policy July 2014, and the SPD. These policies seek, amongst other things to ensure that development delivers high-quality design, which has regard to the orientation, scale, proportion, mass, character and appearance of an area and which is of a scale and design appropriate to both the site and the area. The proposal also conflicts with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework to achieve well designed places.

Conclusion

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

S Dean

INSPECTOR