



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 29 September 2020 by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3251195

90 Eglinton Hill, Plumstead, LONDON, SE18 3DY

- 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 Gavin King against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/3881/HD, dated 11 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of side extension and construction of a front, side & rear extensions and additional lower ground floor to existing single storey 3 bedroom house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed demolition of existing side extension and construction of front, side & rear extensions plus the creation of a lower ground floor¹ at 90 Eglinton Hill, Plumstead, LONDON, SE18 3DY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/3881/HD, dated 11 November 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1362/01, 1362/10C, 1362/11C.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development, hereby permitted, shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The Council consider that there is a discrepancy with the drawings. However, the lower ground floor plan is simply depicting the floorspace at that level which would be the living/ guest bedroom at the rear and that of the upper ground floor plan. The upper ground floor plan, the roof plan and the

¹ Description taken from the Councils decision notice and appeal form.

elevations are consistent in depicting the proposal above that level and I am happy the drawings are clear and enable the proposal to be understood.

Main Issue

4. The proposed increase to the ridge height and rear single storey extension have been considered by the Council to be acceptable and result in a cohesive, and sub-servient development and I am minded to agree. The main issue is therefore the effect of the front extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. No. 90 is a detached single storey, traditional built dwelling with linked garage. The garage along with an existing shed are located at opposite ends of the dwelling and project forward of the main dwellinghouse up to the front boundary.
6. It overlooks a parking area and the plain façade of a large block of flats with garages at ground floor level and three floors of residential accommodation above. There is no demarcation between Occupation Lane and the parking area resulting in a spacious and open plan area.
7. The property sits on the corner of Eglinton Hill and Occupation Lane. Properties along Eglinton Hill are typically large two and three storey villas that sit within large plots behind modest sized front gardens. Given the appeal sites unique elongated shape and its single storey status, it, along with its immediate neighbours 'The Sycamores' and No. 88 appear somewhat out of character with the prevailing two, three and four storey residential dwellings.
8. The proposal would see the existing staggered pitched roof raised in parts to incorporate a hipped roof with an almost continuous ridge height. The integral garage would be incorporated into a front extension that would result in either end of the property extending out across part of the front elevation and out up to the front boundary. A central recess area would be retained creating a 'U' shaped front façade. It would be somewhat similar in design to that of its immediate neighbour 'The Sycamores' where the front entrance is also set back from two adjacent wings that sit up close to the common boundary.
9. The front extension would be of a scale and appearance which would remain subservient and appropriate to the host building. Its design would create a cohesive and symmetrical front façade which would be similar in style to that of its immediate neighbour. Moreover, whilst the proposed extension would be visible from the public realm, its forward position and relationship with the common boundary would retain the spacious and open plan layout of the area particularly that of which it overlooks in Occupation Lane, thereby retaining the prevailing character of the area. Whilst some properties in the area are set back behind large front gardens that is not the character of the various bungalows which front onto Occupation Lane closely adjacent to the highway. The proposal would not lead to a significant alteration in that existing character.
10. Whilst the proposal would exceed the size of a regular front porch, for the reasons discussed above, it would not appear bulky or adversely affect the character of the street, it therefore complies with the aims of the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and

Conversions Guidance (2018) which seeks development to respect the street scene and character of the area.

11. In its specific context, the proposed front element of the development does not appear discordant or uncharacteristic of the area. Accordingly, it does not harm the character and appearance of the area and thereby accords 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 (2014) which together seek residential extensions to be designed to protect the local character.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings and to require that the development is carried out in accordance with them as this provides certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the finished building, a condition is attached to require that the external materials match those of the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Witherley

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, agree that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR