



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: 14 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3299727

24 Southspring, Greenwich, Avery Hill DA15 8EA

- 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 Hekuran Vata against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/0576/HD, dated 17 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 May 2022.
 - The proposed development is a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension at 24 Southspring, Greenwich, Avery Hill DA15 8EA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/0576/HD, dated 17 February 2022, 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: 1844 – 01, 02, 03 and 04.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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') advises that extensions should be sensitive to the original building and to the buildings around it; that they should respect the character of the area; and that they should avoid the loss of open character between properties. It continues that side extensions should reflect the style of the main house and be secondary in size and appearance; that their height should be proportionate to the main house; and that their width should be less than half of it.

4. The host sits within a residential area comprising a mix of mainly terraced and semi-detached two storey properties, which are in a broadly similar style, with a hipped or gabled roof form, and which have a red brick finish. The dwellings are set back from the road, with those on corner plots typically having a large open area to the side, particularly above ground floor level.
5. No 24 Southspring is the end property in a long two storey red brick terrace, which is sited at the junction with Radfield Way. Its large side garden contains a garage and a domestic shed.
6. According to the Council's calculations, measured across its front face, the proposed extension would have a width marginally over half that of the host, thus contrary to the advice in the SPD. However, the slight set down of its roof line and its set back at first floor would provide some articulation, and together with its width would ensure a degree of subordinacy.
7. Moreover, I observed that the terrace has a very horizontal form, which is further emphasized by its window proportions, particularly at first floor. This scheme would respect that existing form and fenestration; it would be faced in matching brickwork and tiles; and its hipped roof would be consistent with the terrace's existing roof form.
8. Additionally, the scheme's flank would be set well back from Radfield Way, and a large side garden and a significant visual gap above ground floor level would therefore be retained.
9. Consequently, the scheme would harm neither the character and appearance of the host property, nor the wider area. It would not therefore conflict with the broad thrust of the SPD, nor would it conflict with 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. Amongst other things, these require high quality design that enhances the local context; and state that extensions should be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and the locality.
10. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have imposed the standard time limit condition and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Additionally, in the interests of good design and local character, a matching materials condition is necessary.
11. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR