



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3310797

8 Overmead, Sidcup DA15 8DS

- 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 Ms Holly Watkins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/2139/HD, dated 22 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the garage and the erection of a double storey side extension and a single storey rear extension 3.0m deep incorporating a pitched roof and Velux lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house with a hipped roof. It forms part of a group of handsome 1930s semi-detached houses of similar appearance most of which include attached garages to the side with gaps above at first floor level. These gaps are an important aspect of the character and appearance of the houses on the south side of the street and a feature to which I attach significant weight. On the northern side of Overmead, some of the gaps have been infilled which has severely disrupted the unity of the group of houses.
4. The proposal would include the erection of a 2-storey side addition, the upper level of which would be set slightly behind the building line of the front elevations. A hipped roof would be formed above this addition to match the slope and form of the existing.
5. The extension would fill the entirety of the gap between the house and the side boundary and would unbalance the symmetrical arrangement of the appeal property and its attached pair, 6 Overmead. In the context of a group of houses that largely retain their original form, and in particular the side gaps at first floor level, the proposal would be an incongruous and jarring addition to the host building and the street scene.

6. Due to its size, siting and design I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene. Therefore it fails to comply 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. There is also conflict with 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).

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR