



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3231093

7 Bayfield Road, Eltham SE9 6BN

- 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 Andrii Mikhailov against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 19/1450/HD, dated 12 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and erection of double storey side extension incorporating front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The side extension would disrupt the rhythm of the roofscape by introducing a considerably large flat roof area. This would be discordant with the uniform pitch and shape of the existing main roofs of the terrace. The incongruity of the roof would be clearly seen from the street as well as from nearby properties.
4. The side extension would be stepped back at first floor level. Nonetheless, the ground floor would project further forward than any part of the existing terrace, including the porch at one of the mid terrace properties. The size of the proposed forward projection would disrupt the symmetry to the flat facades at the end terrace properties. Its position at the end of the existing terrace would make it prominent in the streetscene.
5. While the rear extension is relatively large, it would replace an existing feature of a similar scale. Moreover, there is not the same consistency in the appearance and form of the rear elevations in the row, as there is to the front.
6. As there is limited information before me regarding other extensions in the area, I cannot be sure that they represent a direct comparison to the proposal before me. Furthermore, from my site visit, I saw that there were no end of terrace extensions in the same street. Where there were such extensions in the

wider area these were not viewed with the appeal site and did not have the same flat roof element as the appeal scheme.

7. The proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies and the Royal Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document. These, in part, seek to ensure that developments are sensitive to and respond to the scale and design of the locality and are appropriate to the context of the site.

Other Matters

8. The Council have not included refusal reasons relating to the effect of the scheme on the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties. As I am dismissing the appeal, there is no need for me to consider the matter further. Nonetheless, the lack of harm would be a neutral impact.

Conclusion

9. Therefore, for the reason above, and having taken into consideration all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR