
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3236948

398 Rochester Way, Eltham SE9 6LH

- 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 Mrs Vu Thingocdiep against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 19/1170/HD, dated 27 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2019.
 - The development is for a front porch and single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front porch and single storey side extension at 398 Rochester Way, Eltham SE9 6LH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/1170/HD, dated 27 March 2019, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 12286-01 (Rev. B), 12286-02 (Rev. A) and 12286-03 (Rev. A).

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's decision letter describes the development as retention. It is clear from the evidence provided and my site visit that the front porch and single storey side extension have been constructed and are in use. I shall determine the appeal on this basis accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property at No. 398 Rochester Way (No. 398) is a two storey end-terrace dwelling with a front porch extension, single storey side and rear extension. The property is located in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by semi-detached and terraced properties set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway. A number of the dwellings have front porches of varying style and designs and single storey side extensions that generally appear as clearly subordinate to the main house.
5. The appeal site has an extensive planning history relating to proposals to extend the property, including an appeal dismissed for a similar scheme in

- 2018¹. The proposal would entail the removal of a small roof canopy that forms a bin store that extends from the front porch around the north-eastern corner of the property. The roof canopy adjoins the single storey side extension that extends across the full depth of the house, up to the shared side boundary and projects out slightly forward from the front elevation of the property.
6. The Council's Residential Extensions, Basement and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document July 2016 (SPD) states that front extensions and porches should be minor and should not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. The SPD also states that side extensions should normally be set back slightly from the front wall of the house to allow the original house to remain prominent and set back from the side boundary to ensure room for guttering.
 7. The appeal site is in a relatively large plot and as such the development does not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. Whilst the porch and side extension are visible along Rochester Way, they are seen in the context of the previous extensions and alterations to No. 398 and the nearby properties, including the single storey side extension with half gabled roof at No. 390.
 8. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and siting of the front porch and side extension does not appear significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the nearby properties. The removal of the roof canopy would, in my view, address the concerns raised by the Inspector on the previous appeal regarding the incongruous and dominant nature of the porch and front projection on the house. The use of matching materials and fenestrations ensures that the development sits relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the main property and allows the development to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the main house. I therefore consider that the overall scale, form and use of light grey render on the front porch and side extension does not significantly detract from the architectural integrity of the host property and the area.
 9. Consequently, I conclude that the development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be consistent with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies July 2014 and the SPD. These policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is of a high quality of design that respects the local context in terms of appearance, scale and design of the scheme, responds to the overall character of the area and provides a positive relationship between the proposed and the existing urban context.
 10. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 55, I have specified the approved plans as a planning condition as this is necessary to provide certainty.
 11. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/E5330/D/18/3207180