



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2023

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3312362

2 King William Walk, Greenwich SE10 9JH

- 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 Robbie Martin against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/2857/HD, dated 25 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effect on:
 - The character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area with reference to the West Greenwich Conservation Area (the CA) and the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site (the WHS); and
 - The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers with reference to 3 King William Walk (No.3).

Reasons

3. The appeal dwellings is a Victorian palisaded two storey end of terrace house. It is located on the west side of King William Walk, a street that leads from the Cutty Sark visitor attraction and Greenwich market area towards Greenwich Park. It is located at one end of a terrace of similar London stock brick houses and its flank is adjacent to the Greenwich Tavern public house.
4. The terrace in which the appeal dwelling sits forms part of an historic and high quality streetscape, which, on the same side of the street as the appeal dwelling, includes more substantial three storey houses, public houses and three storey Georgian properties with shops at the ground floor. The other side of the street is defined by substantial post war properties in the classical idiom, with associated grand gardens. This results in a varied but harmonious streetscene that contributes to the significance of the CA and the WHS.
5. The proposal is for a single storey ground floor extension with a lean-to roof at the rear of the appeal dwelling. This would infill the space between an existing substantial two storey outrigger and the boundary of the appeal dwelling with

the neighbouring property at No.3. The outrigger is a common design feature of the terrace of houses of which the appeal dwelling forms part and defines the footprint and rear aspect of the houses in the terrace.

6. The proposal would be as deep as, and would integrate with, the ground floor of the existing outrigger, providing a large open plan kitchen dining area, along with toilet and shower facilities and a small office. A new larger four leaf fully folding door would replace the existing rear door to the outrigger. This would sit within an enlarged door opening that would span across the rear elevation of the existing outrigger and also that of the proposed extension.
7. The scale and depth of the proposed extension would significantly increase the footprint of the appeal dwelling and would result in a change to the original layout of the property. This would also result in a smaller squared off rear garden. This would substantially alter the visual relationship with its rear garden and the existing cohesive relationship with the other properties in the terrace. In combination with the rear door spanning the rear elevation of the existing outrigger and proposed extension, this would remove the distinction between the existing dwelling and the proposed extension. This would result in the proposal appearing as an overly large and prominent addition to the appeal property that would not appear as a subservient addition.
8. For this reason, the proposed extension would appear as incongruous in relation to the appeal property and the terrace of which it forms part. This would be apparent from the rear of neighbouring properties and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA or sustain or enhance the significance of the WHS.

Living Conditions.

9. The brick flank wall of the proposal would be approximately 2.48 metres tall and would sit on the boundary of the appeal dwelling with No.3 for its full depth. This boundary is currently defined by an open trellis. The flank brick wall of the proposal would face on to the full length of the side passage at the rear of this neighbouring property and would face onto the flank wall of the outrigger at No.3.
10. The scale and proximity of the proposal would result in a sense of enclosure and tunnelling effect, which would constrain the outlook from the ground floor windows and doors in the flank of the outrigger and rear of No.3. This would be to the extent that from the rear rooms and side passage of No.3 the presence of the proposed extension would be experienced as oppressive by the occupiers of this neighbouring property.
11. For the reasons given above, the proposed extension would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area and substantial harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No.3. This would not accord with the design guidance given in the Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018), and would be contrary to policies DH1, DH(a) and DH(b) of the of Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014) (the Local Plan), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) (the London Plan) and paragraphs 130 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework). These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions, demonstrate high quality design, integrate

with the local area and do not undermine the quality of life of neighbouring residential occupiers.

12. Further, the excessive scale and incongruous effect of the proposed ground floor extension would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA or preserve the significance of the WHS. Therefore, the proposed extension would conflict with policies DH3, DH4 and DH(h) of the Local Plan and policy HC1 and HC2 of the London Plan and section 16 of the Framework, which collectively seek to ensure that development has due regard to the importance of preserving or enhancing heritage assets and conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings.
13. Although I find the harm to the CA and to the significance of the WHS would be considered less than substantial, in accordance with the Framework, great weight should be given to the conservation of those assets.

Conclusion

14. No public benefits have been identified that would outweigh the harm that I have identified above. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR