



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2023

by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3306002

147 Paston Crescent, Greenwich, Eltham SE12 9DZ

- 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 Miss Jennifer Locke against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/1815/HD, dated 28 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'design proposals for a single storey rear extension with internal reconfiguration and a front porch with WC'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The parties agree that the single storey rear extension is acceptable and following my site visit, I see no reason to disagree.
3. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed front porch on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end terrace property on a prominent corner plot in a predominantly residential area. The existing projecting gable forms an attractive feature of the front elevation. Overall, the façade is well balanced, sits comfortably on the site and is largely consistent with the character of the surrounding properties.
5. Despite the use of matching materials, the proposed porch would significantly overlap the projecting gable and would sit awkwardly with the front windows and front gable detail. Its width would create large expanses of brick to either side of the door opening that would be out of proportion with the property's front elevation. Even though the existing porch has a lean-to roof, given the additional width of the proposal, the roof pitch would be a significant feature of the design and incompatible with the existing roof form of the house. Consequently, as a result of its siting, height and width, the proposed porch would detract from the appearance of the host dwelling.
6. While the appeal property is set back from the highway its position on a corner plot would result in the proposed porch being a conspicuous and incongruous feature that would detract from the street scene.

7. The appellant seeks to limit the loss of garden while providing improved hallway space and a downstairs toilet. However, I have no substantive evidence that the proposed extension is the only way to provide this accommodation. In any case this matter does not outweigh the harm I have identified.
8. My attention has been drawn to other extensions on Alnwick Road. However, I note that elements of these extensions, including the orientation in relation to the street, the door and window detailing and the roof designs are different. The existence of other extensions in the locality does not justify the harm I have identified above.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed front porch would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area, in conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan (March 2021) and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014) which seek to ensure that development promotes local distinctiveness while maintaining appropriate detailing and scale. It would also conflict with the Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (July 2016) which promotes high quality design and states that extensions should be of an appropriate scale with a complimentary roof design. Similarly, there is conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure development is visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

Other Matters

10. I recognise that there have been no objections raised by neighbours in relation to the proposed development, but this does not alter my conclusions on the main issue.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the Framework. There are no other matters which would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

K Allen

INSPECTOR