



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2023

by S Rawle BA (Hons) Dip TP Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3303514

177 Alnwick Road, Eltham, London SE12 9BX

- 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 Mrs Zadville Reklaitiene against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/1481/HD, dated 2 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is construction of a ground and first floor side 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 area.

Reasons

3. There has been a previous appeal decision for this property.¹ The inspector identified that the appeal property lies within an estate with an attractive, spacious character which derives from the planned layout of streets and properties. Houses are set around a relatively large area of greenspace and the position of houses on the corner of the greenspace form part of the planned layout. The siting and orientation of the houses contributes to the feeling of spaciousness within the estate. Following my site visit I agree with this assessment of the areas character and appearance.
4. The height of the proposed extension in the amended design would only be set down from the ridge line of the main house by a minimal amount and at the rear the set down would be imperceptible. Taken together with the extension's width, which would be more than half the width of the main house, the proposal would result in an extension of excessive scale. Further, as the extension would not appear proportionate or noticeably subservient to the host building, its bulky design would disrupt the existing balanced appearance of the semi-detached pair. Consequently, on this prominent corner plot, the proposed extension would dominate the existing building and appear as an obtrusive and discordant feature in the street scene.
5. I accept the appeal plot is larger than some adjacent to it and the proposal would not result in terracing and would be set in from the boundary, but

¹ APP/E5330/D/21/3280441

nevertheless, the proposal would bring a significant building mass closer to the boundary of the site which would erode the existing spacious character of the area.

6. I have taken account of the fact that extensions have been added to other properties in the street. However, these other properties do not have the same relationship with their surroundings and so their impact is materially different. Therefore, these other extensions do not justify harmful development on the appeal site.
7. Overall I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London March 2021 and policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies adopted 30 July 2014, which amongst other things seek to achieve high quality design that promotes local distinctiveness, and that extensions should respect the scale and character of the host building, the street scene and the surrounding area.
8. The proposal would also be at odds with the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document adopted 20 July 2016 which sets out that the height and width of side extensions should be proportionate to the main house and where the width should be less than half the width of the main house. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.
9. I have not based my decision on Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan since these policies were not cited in the Council's reasons for refusal and therefore are not a matter of dispute between the parties.

Other Matters

10. I accept that the extension would allow the appellant to create more family living space so they could continue living in the area. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified above. I also note that following pre-application discussions the proposal was amended. However, notwithstanding those amendments, the submitted scheme results in harmful development for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S Rawle

INSPECTOR