



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 November 2022

by A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 FEBRUARY 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3305122

27 Wynford Way, Eltham SE9 3EJ

- 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 Rob Keith against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/1471/HD, dated 25 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side with ground floor rear extension, front extension, floor plan redesign and all associated works at 27 Wynford Way.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area, the host dwelling and the terrace of dwellings, with particular regard to the siting, scale and design of the proposed extensions.

Reasons

3. No. 27 Wynford Way is an end terraced two storey dwelling on a corner plot, fronting Wynford Way, situated in an established residential area. These properties have a distinctive terraced form, which is repeated several times in the immediate locality. The terraces feature end properties with lower pyramidal roofs and a central chimney stack, set much further forward than the central four properties that have a higher hipped roof. Beyond the front boundary hedge of the appeal site is a grassed area including some trees, with the side elevation of appeal site abutting The Underwood.
4. The proposed two-storey extension's gabled form would be alien to the pyramidal roof form of No. 27 and the hipped form of the central terraced dwellings. Furthermore, the proposed side extension would be more than half the width of the host property and extend well beyond its rear elevation. These matters, together with the offset front gable and roof ridge, the raised first floor window heights, the removal of the central chimney stack, and its elongated blank side elevation, would result in a proposal that would be wholly discordant to the host property and would erode the uniformed appearance of the terrace of dwellings.
5. Moreover, the siting of the proposed two storey side extension would be prominently sited in front of the established building line on The Underwood, to

the side of the appeal site. As a result of this, and its inappropriate design and excessive scale, the side extension would also be visually jarring and result in a loss of openness to both The Underwood and Wynford Way.

6. The proposed single storey front extension would bring the property even further forward than the adjoining central terraced properties, and would result in a prominent, discordant feature on this otherwise uniform terrace.
7. The rear single storey mono-pitched roof extension would be of a modest scale and would relate sympathetically to the host dwelling. It is noteworthy the Council also concluded similarly on this aspect. However, this aspect of the proposal would not be severable from the other elements, and I have based my assessment on the development proposed as a whole.
8. In conclusion, I find the proposed two storey side and single storey front extensions to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, the host dwelling and the terrace of dwellings, contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan, The Spatial Strategy for Greater London, adopted March 2021, and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan, Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, adopted 2014, which collectively require extensions to be high quality and respect the locally distinctive character and form of the host building and the area. There is also conflict with the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance, Supplementary Planning Document (REBC), adopted 2016 in terms of two storey extensions and front extensions which has similar objectives. Amongst other matters, paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design guidance and supplementary planning documents, which in this case includes the REBC. The proposal is also contrary to Paragraph 130 of the Framework, which requires developments to be sympathetic to the local character, amongst other things.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has raised the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in paragraph 11 of the Framework, in support of their appeal. However, this proposal is in clear conflict with relevant policies of the adopted development plan, and the dismissal of this appeal in this case, would be consistent with paragraph 11 of the Framework.
10. I note that the appeal site is not listed or within a Conservation Area, the proposed extensions would have matching materials, there would be no unacceptable effects upon neighbouring occupiers, and that there are no third party objections raised, however these are neutral matters which neither weigh in favour or against the proposal.
11. The appellant's comments; that allowing the appeal would result in the removal of some existing structures at the site; prevent fly tipping; create a low maintenance garden; as well as their personal circumstances and desire for a garage are noted, however they do not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no other considerations which

indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR