



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2021

by Julie Dale Clark BA(Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3277210

6 Biddenden Way, Eltham SE9 3DW

- 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 Ivan Topuzov against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/1458/HD, dated 20 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is ground and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider that the main issues are the effect of the extension on (1) the character and appearance of the area; and (2) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, No 8 Biddenden Way.

Reasons

Character & Appearance

3. The appeal site is an end terrace property and the proposal would extend to the rear at ground and first floor levels. The proposal would extend across most of the width of the house at ground floor level but the first floor would be set in from the boundary with No 8. It would be closest to the boundary with No 4, a semi-detached house that is located further forward in the road than the terrace. The ground floor element would be close to the boundary with the adjoining terraced house, No 8.
4. London Plan Policy D3¹ encourages a design-led approach that, amongst other things, responds to the site's context and is of a high quality. Local Plan² Policy DH1 indicates that all developments are required to be of a high standard of design and positively contribute to the improvement of the built and natural environments. Policy DH(a) advises that residential extensions should be

¹ Mayor of London The London Plan The spatial development strategy for Greater London, March 2021.

² Royal Borough of Greenwich - Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, Adopted 30 July 2014.

limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and the locality. Further advice is provided by the Councils SPD for residential extensions³.

5. This end terrace property has a hipped roof and the first floor extension would follow the angle of the existing roof. It would be slightly more than half the width of the existing house and project close to the existing first floor window. This proximity and the slight overhang of the eaves would be a relatively modest flaw in the design. It would have a ridge substantially below that of the main house and its rear projection would not be excessive. As an end house, it would be capable of accommodating the first floor extension without detracting from the overall character of the terrace. Being to the rear of the house, it would not affect the street scene.
6. The single storey element would be substantial, extending beyond the first floor element and with a roof height just below the cill of an upper floor window. Whilst I am not averse to a first floor extension, the total effect of the large single storey extension and the first floor extension would represent a sizeable addition. The total effect of the extensions would detract from the character and appearance of the house and from the terrace as a whole. As such, the proposal would conflict with the policies and SPD above. I have taken into consideration that the proposal would be to the rear of the house but this does not alter my conclusion.

Living Conditions

7. The extension would project close to the boundary with No 8 and although an existing conservatory would be removed, the extension would project considerably further to the rear and be higher. Local Plan policy DH(b) seeks to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers. No 8 has not been extended and the overall size of this extension would appear excessive so close to the boundary. Due to the orientation of the houses, the extension is unlikely to cause overshadowing and any loss of light would be minimal, it would though present a poor outlook and appear quite overbearing. As such it would conflict with this policy.

Conclusion

8. I have found that the proposal overall would detract from the character and appearance of the house and the terrace and therefore conflict with London Plan Policy D3 and Local Plan policies DH1 and DH(a) and the Council's SPD. It would also be overbearing to the occupiers of No 8 contrary to Local Plan Policy DH(b). I have taken all matters raised into consideration but none alter my conclusion.
9. I conclude that the proposed extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, No 8 Biddenden Way. It would conflict with the policies referred to and therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

³ Royal Borough of Greenwich - Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance, December 2018 (SPD).