

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2021

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3263964

159 Alnwick Road, Eltham, SE12 9BX

- 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 Robinson against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 20/2859/HD, dated 22 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a double storey side extension at 159 Alnwick Road, Eltham, SE12 9BX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/2859/HD, dated 22 September 2020, 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 plan: Drg No ALN159/1 Rev A.
 - 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. Since the date of the decision The London Plan 2021 (LP 2021) was published on 1 March 2021 and is now part of the development plan. The Council's decision notice referred to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2016 (LP 2016), which are now superseded. The main parties for the appeal were invited to express their views on the LP 2021 insofar as it relates to the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 159 Alnwick Road and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, end of terrace house with a hipped roof occupying a corner location at the head of a short stretch of cul-de-sac. The unattached neighbouring property at No 161 is set perpendicular to the appeal site with the side boundary between both set at an oblique angle. The proposal is for the erection of a two-storey side extension with a stepped side elevation to reflect the irregular shape of the plot.
5. The Council's *Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018* (SPD) requires that side extensions should accurately reflect the style of the main house and remain secondary in size and appearance, for roof pitches to match the original house, and for ridge heights to be below the existing ridge height. It also normally requires the extension to be set back slightly from the front wall of the existing dwelling and to be proportionate to the main house, normally less than half its width.
6. The appeal proposal would satisfy the SPD's requirements insofar as they relate to the style of the extension's roof, its lower ridge height, and the recessed front wall. The Council's sole concern rests with the overall width of the extension, which would exceed half the width of the existing property. However, No 159 is part of a longer terrace and when the building is considered as a whole, the side extension would not appear as a disproportionate addition. Moreover, it would have a large step to the front elevation which would noticeably break up its perceived scale and bulk. Added to this, its corner location at the terminal end of the cul-de-sac means that the widest, and most recessed part of the extension, would be largely out of site from the public domain. Whilst there would technically be a breach of the Council's guidelines, the site-specific circumstances in this case means that the proposal would appear appropriate in its setting and subservient in relation to the existing dwelling, the original form of which would stand proud and dominant.
7. For these reasons, I am satisfied that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the host property or the wider area. As such, I find no conflict with Policy DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014), which requires residential extensions to be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality, or with Policy DH1, which more generally requires high quality design in all developments. I also find no conflict with LP 2021 Policy D3, which has been drawn to my attention by the Council since the appeal was made as a relevant replacement for LP 2016 Policies 7.4 and 7.6. This requires development proposals to respond positively to local distinctiveness through, amongst other things, their scale, appearance, and shape.

Conditions

8. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to control the external materials to be used.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR