



---

## 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: 29<sup>th</sup> March 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3315754**

**14 Earls Hall Road, London SE9 1PT**

- 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 Andaleeb Chowdhary against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich
  - The application Ref 22/3997/HD, dated 29 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2023.
  - The development proposed is the construction of a glazed veranda above the patio area.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. The development for which planning permission is sought has been constructed. This appeal therefore relates to an application for retrospective planning permission.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey end-of-terrace house. It is situated in a residential street comprising terraced houses of similar age and appearance. Like many of its neighbours, the appeal property has a full-width, single-storey rear extension and a rear dormer.
5. The appeal scheme comprises a glass roofed veranda structure. This is attached to the earlier extension, occupies the whole width of the site, and extends a significant distance to the rear of the house. This structure is largely open to the rear and sides and its design and materials reflect that of the fenestration in the rear elevation of the house.
6. Whilst the appeal scheme is a relatively lightweight and transparent structure, due to its size, siting and appearance it is a highly incongruous and alien feature that is at odds with the characteristics of its setting and the host building.

7. For these reasons the appeal scheme has an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It therefore fails to accord 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).
8. The appellant has referred to the recently constructed single-storey rear extensions to 10 and 12 Earlsall Road. Both schemes are attached to the original rear elevation of the host property and both extend significantly less far into the rear gardens than the appeal scheme and are not therefore directly comparable to it. In any event, each planning application and appeal must be considered on its individual merits having regard to its specific siting and design. As such I attribute limited weight to the schemes referred to.
9. I note the prior approval approved in 2019 (ref: 19/3196/PN1) for a single-storey rear addition that would extend 6m beyond the original rear wall of the house. The appellant since chosen to construct the veranda structure rather than the prior approval scheme. I therefore consider it unlikely the prior approval scheme would be built in the event of this appeal being dismissed and therefore do not view it as a credible fall-back scenario. Consequently, I attribute limited weight to it.
10. I recognise that permitted development rights allow quite sizeable outbuildings to be constructed in rear gardens provided they are incidental to the enjoyment of a dwellinghouse and satisfy various size limitations. However, there is nothing before me to demonstrate that a structure comparable to the appeal scheme would accord with permitted development right limitations and therefore I attribute limited weight to this matter as well.

## **Conclusion**

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

*S Poole*

INSPECTOR