



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2023

by A Wright BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 APRIL 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3309976

72 Chapel Farm Road, Greenwich, Eltham SE9 3NQ

- 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 Edward Jackson against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/2413/HD, dated 16 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2022.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'Hip to gable loft conversion, single storey rear extension, double storey side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. It has been put to me that the consideration of the appeal proposal should allow for the existing approvals on the appeal site (relating to a single storey rear extension and hip to gable loft conversion including dormer) and thus only those elements which are genuinely new should be addressed. However, I observed on my site visit that those approved schemes had not been constructed and the appeal proposal seeks planning permission for the details shown on the proposed plans, which includes rear and roof extensions amongst other aspects. Accordingly, although I consider the relevance of the existing approvals against the proposed development as part of my overall decision, my initial consideration of the merits of the proposal is based on the proposed plans submitted with the appeal.
3. The description of development set out in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. However, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details, including the appeal form, that the development comprises the demolition of an existing garage and construction of a 2 storey side extension, front porch, new windows to side elevation, single storey rear extension and a hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer and 3 rooflights to front roof slope. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey house located within a residential area where hipped-roof semi-detached properties are prevalent. Some dwellings

have hip to gable roof extensions and/or two storey side extensions. However, the appeal property and the adjoining house retain their original hipped roofs. As such, the locality is characterised by properties with hipped roofs and the original overall form of many is also generally still visible.

6. The hip to gable roof extension together with the lower hipped roof would create an ungainly, disjointed roof shape and a loss of symmetry with the adjoining semi-detached dwelling, resulting in an incongruous addition visible from Chapel Farm Road. The proposed rear dormer would be visible from Lavidge Road. As it would obscure a significant part of the roof and have a large boxy design, it would be a discordant addition to the property.
7. The first-floor front walls of the side extension would align with those on the original house so the proposal would not be subservient to the original dwelling. The front porch would project a similar distance to the existing bay window but would extend across the existing front door and the proposed side extension. The lack of any set back of the side extension and the width of the porch would result in a dominant addition where the original dwelling would not remain prominent, harming the appearance of the host property and street scene. The presence of side extensions, including the lack of set back, on other properties in the locality and the fact that a flat roof may not be permissible does not lead me to a different conclusion.
8. The side extension and side windows would replace an existing garage and result in the house being located closer to the neighbouring property at No 74 Chapel Farm Road (No 74) which already has a two-storey side extension. However, as the appeal dwelling is set back from the house at No 74 and an existing side access between the properties would remain, the proposal would not create a "terracing effect."
9. The proposed ground floor rear extension would be located between existing single storey rear extensions on the dwellings to each side. Whilst it would be relatively large and bulky, it would be screened in views from Lavidge Road by boundary fences, outbuildings, and existing extensions, and it would be sited within a relatively spacious garden. As a result, the single storey rear extension would not harm the appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. The rooflights to the front roof slope would be small scale and the tiled roof would remain the predominant feature in views from Chapel Farm Road. As such, they would also not harm the character of the area.
10. Although I have not found harm in respect of the ground floor rear extension and front rooflights, the remaining parts of the proposal would result in a bulky, discordant addition to the appeal property, causing harm to the host dwelling, the pair of semi-detached properties and the wider street scene. I appreciate that the proposed development has some support locally and it is said that no additional overlooking would arise, but this does not alter the harm that I have found.
11. The appellant has referred to other similar examples of side, roof and front extensions in the wider area. However, I am not aware of the policy context in which they were constructed, and this limits the weight that I can give to them. As such, the presence of other extensions in the area does not outweigh the harm I have found in relation to the proposal.

12. For the reasons above, I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014. Together, these require developments to take account of spatial character and extensions to be of a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality. It would also conflict with paragraphs 130 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which sets out that development should be sympathetic to local character and development that is not well designed should be refused. Additionally, it would not comply with the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018 which requires side extensions to reflect the style and remain secondary in size and appearance to the main house, roof extensions to not alter the roof pitch and front extensions to not adversely affect the appearance of the house and street scene.

Other Matters

13. I note that the appeal site benefits from a planning permission and a prior approval for a single storey rear extension, and from a certificate of lawfulness for a hip to gable loft conversion. I have been provided with a copy of the previously approved plans and it seems probable that the schemes would be implemented in the event of this appeal failing. The proposed development includes elements additional to the previous schemes and therefore they are not comparable. The appeal proposal would cause more harm than those previously approved.

Conclusion

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

A Wright

INSPECTOR