



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3300895

170 Green Lane, Greenwich, Eltham SE9 3XB

- 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 S Chana against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/1095/HD, dated 29 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is a ground and first floor side extension and a ground floor rear 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 property and the area.

Reasons

3. The Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018 ('SPD') sets out that two storey side extensions are likely to have an impact on the character and setting of the street. It states at paragraphs 5.26 to 5.29 that they should reflect the style of the main house, be secondary in size and appearance, and that their roof should reflect the roof pitch of the original house.
4. The host property is located at the end of a row of broadly similar two storey semi detached dwellings, with hipped or gabled roofs, and which display many common design features such as curved bay windows with gables on their front face. Although originally constructed with a hipped roof, the host has recently had a hip to gable and rear dormer roof extension in accordance with a Lawful Development Certificate.
5. The proposed side extension would be set back from the host's front face at first floor level, its roof would be set down compared to the host's ridgeline, and its width would be less than half that of the host. Consequently, it would appear secondary in size. In those regards, and given that the host's existing garage is level with the dwelling's front face, the scheme would accord with the advice in the SPD.

6. However, contrary to the SPD, its roof form, which would include a hip and a flat section of crown roof which would extend to the rear of the host's ridgeline, would fully reflect neither the original property's roof, nor its current design.
7. Notwithstanding the use of matching facing materials and fenestration, that discordant form would give the resultant dwelling a very contrived and awkward appearance. The harm that it would cause would be clearly visible from public vantage points when approaching along Green Lane from the north, as well as in front of the site.
8. As illustrated at paragraph 2.4 of the appellant's appeal statement, there are examples of extensions in the wider area whose roof form is at odds with their respective host. Nevertheless, those examples are the exception, and I observed that in some cases they are in less visible locations to the rear, or that they do not disrupt the streetscene to the extent proposed here. However, given that the host is the last house before the railway bridge, the scheme would not result in a terracing effect.
9. Whilst I have had regard to the site's planning history and have noted the changes compared to a previously refused scheme on the site (Ref: 21/4424/HD), I have dealt with the proposal before me on its planning merits.
10. For the above reasons, the scheme would conflict with those parts of Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014, which set out the need for high quality design which pays due regard to building types, forms and proportions; and for roof extensions which respect the scale and character of the host building and the streetscene.
11. It would also conflict with the advice in the SPD, and with the National Planning Policy Framework requirement for visually attractive architecture which is sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.
12. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR