



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3311933
372 Rochester Way, London SE9 6LH

- 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 Serghei Butescu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/2412/HD, dated 18 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a two-storey side extension and front bay window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the construction of a two-storey side extension. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted in so far as it relates to the construction of a front bay window at 372 Rochester Way, London SE9 6LH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/2412/HD, dated 18 July 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: RPS/05GRE/01A; RPS/05GRE/03A; RPS/05GRE/06A; RPS/05GRE/08A in so far as they relate to the works approved.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The second reason for refusal refers to discrepancies on the application drawings regarding the width of the proposed two-storey side extension. These discrepancies are minor and do not prevent me from assessing the proposal. As the majority of the drawings show a 3m wide extension I have assessed the proposal on that basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey house situated next to the junction between Rochester Way and Lynsted Gardens. It forms one end of a terrace of 4 symmetrically arranged houses with a hipped roof and it has a long side boundary flanking Lynsted Gardens.
5. The terrace forms part of a planned residential estate comprising short terraces and semi-detached houses of similar age and appearance. Many of these houses have been altered and some, including the appeal property, have been extended to the rear. However, the original pattern of development remains largely in place. In particular, the front gardens and, in some cases such as the appeal property, side gardens, give the area a relatively spacious and verdant appearance, a matter to which I attach significant weight.
6. The proposal would primarily comprise the erection of a 2-storey side addition. This would have a slight set-back at the front at first floor level and a hipped roof would be formed with a ridge set slightly below the ridge of the host building. The rear elevation of the extension would align through with the original rear elevation of the terrace.
7. The side extension would occupy a large proportion of the garden at the side of the property. The gap between the appeal property and 370 Rochester Way, the house on the other side of Lynsted Gardens, would be reduced and the symmetrical arrangement between these neighbouring properties compromised. Due to its exposed corner location, the extension would be a highly prominent element in the street scene and would disrupt overall uniformity and spaciousness of the area. It would also unbalance the symmetrical arrangement of the terrace.
8. For these reasons I conclude that, due to its size and siting, the proposed side extension would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene. It therefore 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).
9. The proposal also includes the replacement of the ground floor front window with a bay window with a pitched roof. This would be similar in size and design to the bay windows on neighbouring properties in the terrace and elsewhere in the area. I am therefore satisfied that this element would have an acceptable effect on the appearance of the host property and the street scene and, consequently, it accords with the aforementioned policies. As this element is functionally and physically severable from the side extension a split decision can be issued allowing this part of the proposal.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider a materials condition is required to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore,

for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring the approved development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings is imposed.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail in respect of the 2-storey side extension and succeed in respect of the front bay window.

S Poole

INSPECTOR