
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2020

by S Harley BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI ARICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3241380

4 Alnwick Road, Eltham, SE12 9BD

- 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 E Ciftci against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 19/2910/HD, dated 15 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 November 2019.
 - The development proposed, as described on the application form, is single storey rear extension, two storey side extension, loft conversion with dormer and front porch.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The proposal is described by the Council on the decision notice as "construction of part one/part two storey side extension, formation of hip-to-gable roof extension with rear dormer, installation of two rooflights to front roof slope and new front porch".
2. The plans also show a rear extension and it is clear from the Development Management Delegated Report (the DMDR) that the Council considered this to be part of the proposal. I have considered the appeal in the same way.

Decision

3. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

4. As set out in the DMDR the Council raises no objections to the proposed single storey rear extension; the front porch; or the two rooflights for the front elevation. Following my observations at my site visit I see no reason to come to a different conclusion in relation to these parts of the proposal.
5. Although not a reason for refusal the Council summarises objections from a neighbour in the DMDR and, as part of the Officer Comments, indicates concerns about the overbearing effect of the proposal in relation to No 2 Alnwick Road.
6. Taking the above into account I consider the main issues for this appeal to be the effect of the proposed two storey side extension with hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host property, its attached neighbours and the street scene; and on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 2 Alnwick Road with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. The appeal property is an end of terrace house in an area of predominantly semi-detached and terraced houses. No 2 Alnwick Road is some distance from the side wall of No 4 and is angled away from it. In this instance a setback from the front elevation would not be necessary to prevent the appearance of a terracing effect between Nos 2 and 4 as a sufficient gap between the proposed two storey side wall and the side wall of No 2 would be retained.
8. However, in omitting a lower eaves and ridge line, the proposal fails to reflect the form and character of the host property and its attached neighbours. This is part of the character of this terraced block as it steps up along the rising levels of Alnwick Road. In addition the conversion of the hipped roof to a gable would further unbalance the terraced block, in a very prominent location on the inside of a bend, opposite a wide junction and open space. It would appear visually discordant and over dominant. Moreover, because of its length and height, the proposed dormer would appear as a flat roof at ridge height, further detracting from the character and appearance of the terraced block and the street scene.
9. For the reasons set out above I conclude the proposed two storey side extension with hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property, its attached neighbours and the street scene. Accordingly it would conflict with those parts of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 (the LP); Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (the CS); and the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD). These together seek high quality design which respects the character of the area; seek to limit residential extensions to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality; and seek to limit the use of prominent flat roofs. It would also be contrary to those principles of the National Planning Policy Framework that seek good design that respects the character and appearance of the area,

Living conditions

10. No 2 is to the north of the appeal site and has a triangular shaped rear garden, with its house set forward of the house at No 4 and at an angle to it. The proposed side extension and full width dormer, due to its scale and design and position south of, and close to, the shared boundary, would appear large and overbearing when viewed from the house and garden at No 2. It would create a gloomy and oppressive outlook and an unneighbourly sense of enclosure. For these reasons I conclude that the two storey side extension with hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of occupiers of No 2. It would conflict with those parts of Policies DH(a) and DH(b) of the CS and the SPD which seek to ensure extensions respect the amenities of adjacent occupiers.

Other Matters

11. The appellant considers that some elements of the proposal could be deemed to be permitted development¹. However, it is not asserted that the proposal as

¹ Town and Country (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)

a whole is permitted development and so I give little weight to the so-called “fallback position” in this case.

12. I acknowledge the wish of the appellant to obtain as much functional internal space as possible for the occupants. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the street scene and the harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property.

Conclusion

13. In failing to comply with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the LP or Policies DH1, DH(a) and DH(b) of the CS the proposal cannot comply with the development plan taken as a whole. The appeal is dismissed.

S Harley

INSPECTOR