

---

# Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 November 2021

**by John Gunn DipTP, DipDBE, MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 2 December 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/21/3278005**

**80 & 82 Calvert Road, Greenwich, London SE10 0DF**

- 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 Guyett, Chell, Bailey, & Steele against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
  - The application Ref 20/3293/F, dated 27 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2021.
  - The development proposed is a joint planning application for the construction of part 1/part 2-storey rear extensions.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development above from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form as it is more succinct than the description included in the planning application form.
3. The Council's decision notice refers to policies of the London Plan 2016. The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (March 2021) (The London Plan 2021) has now been adopted. The Council has provided the revised policies and the appellant has been given the opportunity to make a submission. The Appellants have responded, and I have taken their comments into account. In light of this re-consultation, I am satisfied that no party has been prejudiced by my consideration of the appeal proposal against the policies of The London Plan 2021.

## Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host properties and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

5. The appeal properties are simple and traditional two storey mid terrace dwellings. They form part of a group of buildings where design detail, gaps between outriggers and a consistent roofscape create rhythm, and contribute positively to a defined uniform character and appearance.
6. The proposed first floor elements of the proposal on both Nos 80 and 82 would be considerably wider than the existing first floor outriggers, as evidenced by the corresponding requirement to narrow and reposition the narrowed windows of Bedroom 2 of both houses much closer to each other near their common

boundary. This increase in the width of the outriggers at the first floor would significantly reduce the gap between the respective properties. This would add uncharacteristic bulk and mass to the appeal properties, at odds with the layout and elevational treatment of the rest of the rear of the terrace on this side of Calvert Road.

7. Whilst noting that the proposed extensions would not be visible from the public realm, it would be possible to see them from neighbouring gardens. From these locations, they would appear as incongruous additions to the host properties and would interrupt the pleasant homogeneity of the group of buildings to which they belong.
8. The appellants have drawn my attention to other extensions in the locality. I have noted the cases where a joint approach between neighbours had resulted in developments being permitted. I also saw examples of 2-storey extensions with different roof forms including flat roofs. However, the relationship of those developments to their immediate neighbours, and the area that they were located in, was different to the appeal proposals. Consequently, they were not directly comparable with the appeal proposals. They do not provide justification for development that would fail to add to the overall quality of the host property or the area in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.
9. I would attach some weight to the appellant's desire for additional accommodation to meet their family's needs. However, I remain to be convinced that the appeal scheme is the only way of achieving that. Against the substantial weight I would ascribe to the harm and conflict with the development plan I have found, this would not therefore be sufficient for me to allow the appeal.
10. The proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area in the terms that I have described. This would be contrary to policy D3 of The London Plan 2021, policy DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies and the Royal Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance SPD. These policies require, amongst other things, that developments should provide high quality design that enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regards to existing building types, forms and proportions.

## **Conclusion**

11. There are no other relevant material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan as a whole. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*John Gunn*

INSPECTOR