



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01/03/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3251170

248 Broadwalk, Kidbrooke, London SE3 8NQ

- 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 Franscois Adams against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 19/4002/HD, dated 20 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is for construction of a part 1, part 2 storey side and rear extension and associated external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a part 1, part 2 storey side and rear extension and associated external alterations at 248 Broadwalk, Kidbrooke, London in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/4002/HD, dated 20 November 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL14.1, PL14.2, PL14.3, PL14.4, PL14.5, PL14.6, PL14.7, PL14.8, PL14.10, PL14.12 and PL14.14.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning decision notice following a letter from the Local Planning Authority seeking agreement that this description more accurately reflected the proposals. The appellant raised no objections to this and accordingly, I have used the description given on the decision notice.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a suburban semi detached house notable for its timber Mock Tudor gable frontage and mix of render and red brick materials. Such architectural features appear throughout several properties along Broadwalk and surrounding streets and I consider these to be a defining characteristic of the area.
5. The property is situated within its own garden plot and has an existing single storey rear extension and a single storey garage that is well set back from the front elevation. Currently the front door to the house is recessed within a porch adjacent to a large bay window.
6. The proposals would see a replacement rear extension and single and partial first floor extensions to the side as well as an infilling of the existing porch recess to the front ground floor of the property. The first floor side extension would be split into two elements with an extension to both front and rear rooms with the first floor central element being removed. The extension would have a low sloping roof that would echo other properties in the street and would be aligned along the same line as the existing bay window frontage.
7. I agree with the parties that there will be no harm in the introduction of the rear ground floor extension. This element of the proposal would replace an existing rear extension and would seem to be suitable to its site. I also note that it is a reasonable assumption that the infilling of the porch would be allowable under current Permitted Development Rights for the property. As such I consider there is the potential of a fallback position where a possibly larger porch extension could be built without the need for planning permission. The proposals to the side of the property are therefore where I consider the main impact would occur.
8. In terms of potential harm I have assessed the contribution of the appeal property to the wider streetscene and conclude that although the property is a representative house type of Broadwalk, it is one of several types of similar suburban homes within the area. As such, although there are definite architectural synergies, the street scene is generally mixed and varied with no dominant housetype being used.
9. The proposed side extension will appear flush to the front of the property and as such there will be no set back as required by the Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions (SPD). I consider that the main harm caused by the lack of set back would be the impact upon the street scene and the potential to create a harmful terracing effect.
10. In this particular case the proposal would appear in line with the existing front elevation of the property but it would not protrude further from the current front elevation of the house. Therefore, due to the form and design of both the appeal property and the proposed extension, the architectural composition of the house would not be harmed. The set in of the first floor element of the extension from the side boundary together with the low sloping roof would also significantly assist in the mitigation of such a terracing effect.
11. As a result, although the proposal would physically introduce a built element to the first and ground floor here, the proposal will not omit the visible space

between the properties or be so close to its neighbour as to create a terrace effect should the neighbouring owners wish to extend in a similar manner in the future. Due therefore to the variation within the street scene, including the set back of the appeal property from its neighbour, I consider it highly unlikely that a harmful terracing effect would occur.

12. As a result the proposals respond to the overall design aesthetics of the appeal property and the streetscene and will not result in such harm as to justify dismissal of this appeal.

Conclusion

13. I conclude that the proposed extensions would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the area, subject to conditions requiring matching materials in the interests of appearance and the specification of plans in the interests of certainty. I therefore conclude that there will be no significant adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area and as such no conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan or policies DH(a), DH(b) or DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014).
14. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all material planning considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Graham

INSPECTOR