



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/22/3311415
126 Brownspring Drive, Eltham, SE9 3LD.

- 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 Ms V. Voda against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/2386/HD, dated 14 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is for a two-storey/first floor side/rear extension.
-

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 and thereby the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 126 Brownspring Drive, is one half of a semi-detached pair of two-storey houses located in a cul-de-sac of identical inter war housing, part of a larger planned residential development.
4. The appellant proposes, following demolition of the garage and part of an earlier single storey rear extension, the erection of a part single, part two-storey side wrap around extension. The side extension would follow the angled line of the boundary to number 128 and therefore it would get wider towards the rear of the property. The front of the proposed extension would come forward of the line of the current garage and align with the main façade of the house. The extension would have a pitched fascia style flat roof.
5. As I saw this house along with most of the neighbouring dwellings has over time been subject to various alterations and extensions, including a number of two-storey extensions. Accordingly, the Council state that it finds no objection to a two-storey side extension in principle. From what I have seen and read I would not form a contrary view.
6. However, the proposed extension, by reason of its total depth, the unmodulated blank façade of the proposed southern elevation, the false pitched fascia detail and the uncomfortable relationship of the pitched fascia roof and

that of the main roof of the house would, in my judgement, significantly detract from the architectural integrity of number 126 and the semi-detached pair.

7. Further, as designed it would erode the form, design, architectural character and the spacious setting of the original planned estate.
8. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that, despite the proposed use of matching materials, the addition as designed would cause significant harm to the character of the application property and would thereby fail to respond to the character of the surrounding area. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the objectives 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, along with other things to the quality of development and the requirement for all development to have a positive relationship between the proposed and existing urban context.

Other Matters

9. I appreciate that the appellant wishes to make better use of underutilised space in her garden, however, given the harm that I have identified I give this consideration limited weight in my deliberations.
10. I have been referred to the appeal decision in respect of 6 Brownspring Drive (APP/E5330/D/18/3206704). As set out above I agree, for the reasons given, that in principle a two-storey side extension would be acceptable here. However, the two-storey addition before me would, by reason of its design cause significant harm the host property and the surrounding area. Further, this harm would not, in this case, be overcome by the conditions imposed in respect of the development a 6 Browning Drive as suggested by the appellant.
11. The appellant has referred me to other nearby single/two-storey extensions. Whatever the background to those cases, their existence is not an appropriate justification for permitting the development here which I have considered on its individual planning merits.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR