



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2021

**by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 13 September 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3275210**  
**78, Boxgrove Road, Abbey Wood, SE2 9JP**

- 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 Abdul Khab against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
  - The application Ref 21/0007/HD dated 22 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2021.
  - The development proposed is erection of part first floor rear extension and single storey side porch extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matters

2. Since the determination of the application, and the submission of this appeal, a revised National Planning Policy Framework 2021 was adopted on 20 July 2021. Given the main issues for the refusal reason, and the fact the refusal reason does not refer directly to the Framework, it is not considered that this change impacts upon the determination of this appeal.
3. Since the determination of this application the London Plan 2021 (a Replacement Plan) has been published by the Mayor. The policies referred to, within the London Plan 2016, are no longer in force. Given the issues raised as a result of the refusal reason, and the Local Plan policies referred to, it is not considered on this occasion that the publication of the London Plan directly changes the assessment of this appeal due to the main issues being based upon character of the area and impact upon the host property.

## Main Issue

4. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the host property and residential character of the area.

## Reasons

5. There are two elements to this appeal proposal. The Council's refusal reason does not raise objection to the single storey side porch extension, and I have no evidence before me to conclude differently on this occasion. In that regard, and for the avoidance of doubt, this appeal will focus upon the first-floor rear extension only. The appeal proposal seeks to add a first-floor extension at a depth of 3.5m at a width of 4.4m (the latter being just over half of the existing dwelling's width) over an existing single storey extension.

6. The Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversion Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD) contains guidance as to first floor rear extensions (pages 23 and 24). The SPD is clear in its guidance that first-floor rear extensions are often discouraged because they can have a greater impact upon neighbouring properties and on the street scene. I find that the proposal is consistent with this guidance with specific regard to neighbouring amenity, however, it is clear that proposals should also be in keeping with the size of the original house and not appear bulky to ensure that the extension would have as little impact as possible upon the character of the house and the street scene. Impact upon the host property and character of the area are thus relevant considerations within the SPD as they are within the relevant Local Plan design policies.
7. The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential area and is an end of terrace dwelling. The appeal site already benefits from a 3.5m depth, full width, single storey rear extension which is noticeable but not overly prominent as it stands. The host dwelling retains its dominance and character consistent with other dwellings in the row. When viewing the row of terraced dwellings within which the site stands only a limited number have single storey extensions and none have first floor extensions. Immediately to the North (side) of the appeal site is a large grassed public area with trees and footpaths through the site. As a result of this the appeal site is prominent and highly visible from the public realm and this makes it more sensitive to development and change. This is particularly notable when approaching from the West and when stood to the North.
8. The hipped roof would, overall, be substantially lower than the existing roof and the materials are noted to largely match. Despite this I find that the scale and bulk of the proposal, particularly when viewed from the side in terms of its depth, results in bulk which is over dominant and unsympathetic to the host dwelling. Combined with the existing rear extension it would present as a notable, block like, projection at two storeys matching the eave height of the host dwelling. This would result in a substantial volume of brick wall facing the public area site which would not positively integrate in the open, prominent, setting which adjoins the appeal site. I find that it would be harmful to the residential character of the area as a result of this and would be visually dominant from the public realm. The harm identified is not reduced because the host dwelling, neighbouring built forms and wider locality are not designated heritage assets.
9. The proposal would be contrary to Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 (CS) Policy DH1 which requires proposals to achieve high quality design and provide a positive relationship between the existing urban context taking into account the scale, bulk and massing of the adjacent townscape and the established layout and spatial character. The proposal would also be contrary to CS Policy DH(a) which requires proposals to be limited to a scale and design appropriate for the building and locality and also contrary to the SPD which seeks to avoid impact upon the character of the house and the street scene.

### **Other Matters**

10. The starting point for determination is the Local Plan in accordance with S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and I have found the

proposal contrary to this for the reasons outlined above. The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) is a material consideration and its previous version has been referred to within the appellant's statement.

11. The Framework seeks to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and good design is part of sustainable development. It confirms that permission should be refused for poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area. In this case, in particular the combination of the depth and massing of the proposal, I find fails to improve the character of the area.

### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Eleni Randle*

INSPECTOR