



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2022

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3298881

43 Strathaven Road, Eltham, London SE12 8BZ

- 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 Barry Vinall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/4491/F, dated 16 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part single, part double storey side extension and single storey rear extension, and demolition of the existing front porch and erection of a new porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the erection of a part single, part double storey side extension and single storey rear extension. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted in so far as it relates to the demolition of the existing front porch and erection of a new porch at 43 Strathaven Road, Eltham, London SE12 8BZ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/4491/F, dated 16 December 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P1, P2, P10 and P11, in so far as they relate to the works approved.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the porch hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house. It forms part of an estate of handsome semi-detached houses with shallow-pitched hipped roofs and curved 2-storey bays at the front. Although the houses have differing forms of garages and single storey additions to the side, they generally retain their original form and appearance at the front giving the street scene in Strathaven Road and surrounding roads a high degree of unity, a matter to which I attribute significant weight.

4. The appeal property occupies a corner site on the junction between Strathaven Road and Craithie Road and benefits from garden space to both the rear and side, a situation that is mirrored by the house on the opposite site of Strathaven Road. This gives the end of the street a relatively spacious and verdant character and appearance.
5. The proposal would include the erection of a part-single and part 2-storey side extension, part of which would extend beyond the main rear building line. The addition would extend close to the side boundary of the property and its width would be greater than that of the host property. The extent, height and bulk of the proposal, combined with the inevitable reduction in greenery next to the side boundary, would result in a highly conspicuous and prominent form of development in this particularly exposed position. In addition, it would unbalance the symmetrical arrangement of the appeal property and its attached pair and the mirrored arrangement with the houses opposite.
6. For these reasons I conclude that the side extension would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. In this respect the proposal therefore fails to accord with Policies DH(a) and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) which, among other matters, require a high quality of design, limited to a scale and design appropriate to the locality. The proposal is also contrary to the aims of Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and the guidance in the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018).
7. The appeal property has a glazed porch at the front, that partly connects to the curved bay. The proposal includes the replacement of this glazed element with a brick porch with an arched opening. Whilst the majority of the houses in the area retain their original entrances and porches are not a common feature in the area, the proposed porch would be more in keeping with the appeal property than the existing one and more compatible with the appearance of neighbouring houses.
8. For this reason I am satisfied that the porch would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area and accords with the aforementioned policies. This element of the proposal is physically and functionally separate from the side extension and therefore a split decision can be issued allowing this part of the proposal.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider a materials condition is required to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring the approved development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings is imposed.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail in respect of the side extension and succeed in respect of the porch. A split decision is therefore issued.

S Poole INSPECTOR