



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2022

by E Brownless BA (Hons) Solicitor (non-practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3276794

1 Delme Crescent, Kidbrooke, SE3 0ED

- 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 Miss Kaker against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref: 21/1023/HD, dated 22 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'double storey side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the host terrace and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The host dwelling is a prominent end of terrace two-storey property situated at the junction of Delme Crescent with Susan Road. Delme Crescent is typically characterised by a mix of dwelling types and styles, with blocks of flats being positioned to one side of the road and to the other, two storey dwellings arranged as terraced rows or semi-detached groups. Nos 1 to 4 Delme Crescent form a group of four terraced dwellings that, despite some minor alterations such as front porches, they retain a pleasantly uniform, balanced and alternating mirrored symmetrical appearance. In this regard, the host dwelling contributes positively to the character and appearance of the terrace and the wider streetscene.
4. The proposal would replace the existing single storey side extension with a part single and part two-storey side extension to the host dwelling. I note the Council's concerns do not relate to the single storey extension and based upon my observations at the time of my site visit, I see no reason to take a different view.
5. The proposal would, in part, extend the width of the host dwelling along its front elevation. Albeit this would be for a limited distance of some 1.6 metres when taking the appellant's measurements, which have not been disputed by the Council, it would unbalance the appearance of the row of houses and remove their sense of symmetry. Whilst part of the two-storey extension would be set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling and include a lower ridge line than the existing property, by reason of its overall bulk it would fail to appear subservient to the host dwelling and result in an unduly dominant

and incongruous addition to the host dwelling, the terrace and the area more generally, particularly given its prominent position as a corner plot.

6. I therefore find that the appeal scheme fails to complement the form and style of the host dwelling and it would have an unbalancing effect on the terraced row. The use of a similar palette of materials and a gable roof structure would not overcome this harm.
7. Overall, I find that the proposed development would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace within which it sits and the surrounding area. The appeal scheme would conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014) insofar as these policies require high quality development that complements the surrounding buildings and the established layout and character of the area and the appearance of the streetscene. In addition, it would be contrary to the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance SPD (2018) which requires, among other things, side extensions to reflect the style of the main house and remain secondary in size and appearance.

Other Matters

8. There would be no adverse harm to the outlook or privacy of neighbouring occupiers. However, the absence of harm is a neutral matter weighing neither for nor against a proposal.
9. I note that the appeal scheme would provide additional living space for a family. However, personal circumstances can seldom overcome general planning principles.

Conclusion

10. The appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan. Having had regard to the material considerations in favour of the proposal, I conclude that these would not outweigh the harm that would be caused. As such, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Brownless

INSPECTOR