



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2023

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3313903

13 Crouch Croft, Eltham, SE9 3HX

- 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 Halil Aysal against the decision of the Council of The Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application 22/3258/HD, dated 28 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is a part one and part two storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on, firstly, the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area and, secondly, the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. There is a degree of consistency in the form, siting and appearance of buildings along Crouch Croft when seen from the road. The proposed side and rear extension would have limited effect on this general pattern of development in such views, due to the set-back of the extension behind the front building line and with a lowered roof height.
4. To the rear of the properties there is a consistent building line and few changes at upper floors. Whilst there are more limited, private views of this, such consistency is a positive factor of the character of the area. I acknowledge that the property and wider area fall within the built-up area and are free from any specific designations that might limit alterations to the house. However, whilst alterations and extensions may be acceptable in principle in order to adapt to changing needs, Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), and the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD) seek to ensure residential extensions are of a scale and design appropriate to the area.

5. In this instance the scale of the proposed extensions would not relate appropriately to the host property or the wider area. The drawings show the first floor being extended the full width to a considerable depth with a pitched and crown roof structure and then, furthermore, a two storey flat-roofed projection beyond that. The scale and design of this extension would be a bulk incongruous to the area, and would significantly disrupt the balanced appearance of the host property.
6. On the first main issue it is therefore concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and hence not consistent with the policies referred to above. As the proposal would not represent good design there is further conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, at Chapter 12 regarding the design of buildings.

Living conditions

7. From my observations at the site visit I consider the depth and height of the two storey addition, and the single storey element, would lead to an overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties. From these observations and based on the information provided to me I am also concerned that there would be a material loss of light to those properties; the size of the extensions is considerable and there is no objective evidence to reassure me otherwise.
8. The drawings show there would be a bedroom with a sole side outlook towards the adjoining house. This is shown to be obscure glazed, but I consider that an unrealistic and unacceptable situation: it would be the habitable room of poor quality, leading either to unacceptable living conditions or pressure to remove the obscure glazing. In any event, even if it was to remain obscure glazed, the proximity and height of that window to the neighbour would create perceived overlooking to the adjoining house.
9. On the second main issue it is therefore concluded the proposal would be harmful to living conditions, contrary to Policy DH(b) of the Core Strategy and the SPD, which seek to protect amenity for adjacent occupiers.

Conclusion

10. I recognise the application made to the Council followed a previous refusal and that modifications were made. However, for the reasons given it is my conclusion the proposed development would conflict with the policies of the development plan. The appeal is dismissed accordingly.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR