



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2023

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3314613

37 Packmores Road, Eltham, SE9 2NB.

- 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 Delwyn Hancock against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/3170/HD, dated 21 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is for a two-storey side extension and part single/part two-storey rear extension and additional parking to front drive.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property, the semi-detached pair and thereby the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 37 Packmores Road, is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with attached single garage. The property has previously had a hip to gable extension and the erection of a large box dormer on the rear roof slope.
4. The appellant proposes the demolition of the garage and the construction of a two-storey side and part one/part two-storey rear extension. It has been designed to maintain a side access way to the rear garden and it would be built from matching materials.
5. The proposed two-storey side extension nearest to the road would have a hipped roof abutting the flank wall of the house as previously extended. However, the rear section would be a large flat roof with a pitched fascia. It would project out closer towards the side boundary than the front section of two-storey extension. The pitched fascia would then return behind the host property and abut the main roof slope.
6. A single storey rear addition, with a lean-to roof would then be built between the flank wall of the two-story extension and the party wall to number 35.
7. The existing eaves line of the house would be maintained, and the ridge of the pitched fascia would be well below the ridge of the main house. However, the pitched fascia would give the extension a squat and therefore bulky appearance.

- Further the relationship to the pitched fascia to the roof would appear awkward and contrived.
8. In addition, due to the lack of architectural detailing, use of materials and lack of modulation and fenestration the flank wall of the proposed addition would appear very bland and utilitarian in the context of the design of the main house.
 9. The proposed single storey addition would have a truncated lean-to roof, pitched at a noticeably shallower pitch than the main roof and the proposed pitch fascia. I consider that this would serve to add to the overall bulky and uncomfortable three-dimensional form and visual appearance of the proposed development.
 10. In addition, the proposed side extension would serve to further denude the symmetry of the semi-detached pair following the earlier hip to gable addition and alterations to number 35.
 11. When considered cumulatively with the previous hip to gable addition and the large box dormer the proposed extension would appear as a large, dominant addition that would visually subsume the original dwelling.
 12. Given the relationship of neighbouring properties one to another and the fact that a gap of at least 1.0 meters would be maintained to the common boundary to number 39 I am not persuaded that the development would result in the terracing effect or significantly result in a loss of the open character of the area identified by the Council. Nevertheless, for all the reasons above I conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposal would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property, the semi-detached pair and thereby the character and appearance of the area.
 13. To allow the development would therefore be contrary to the aims of Policy D3 of the London Plan (Adopted March 2021), Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan-*Core Strategy with Detailed Policies* (Adopted 30 July 2014) and the Royal Borough Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document SPD (Adopted December 2018) as they relate to, along with other things, the quality of design and the requirement for all development to have a positive relationship between the proposed and existing urban context.
 14. In reaching my determination I have had due regard to the other extensions, alterations and additions to nearby properties that have been drawn to my attention and the impact that they have had over time to the character and appearance of the neighbourhood. Nevertheless, I have considered this proposal on its own design merits and in the context of the surrounding development.

Conclusions

15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR