



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 April 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3316498

138 Meadowside, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 6BD

- 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 Eneken Ozigbo-Esere against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/4149/HD, dated 13 December 2022 was refused by notice dated 6 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of garage to habitable room, first floor side extension, single storey rear infill extension and porch to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey end of terrace house with a hipped roof. It is set well back from the street with the front garden given over to car parking. It has been the subject of an existing single storey flat roofed side and rear extension, the majority of the side part of which is a single garage. This existing extension is slightly set in from the front elevation of the original house and reaches to the boundary of the appeal site with the driveway of the neighbouring end of terrace house at 140 Meadowside (No.140).
4. The proposal is to convert the existing garage to habitable space and for a first floor hipped roofed extension, which would align with the front and flank walls of the existing wrap around extension and would align with the rear elevation of the original house. The proposal also includes a small weather porch with a lean-to roof to the existing front door.
5. By not being set in from the boundary with the neighbouring house at No.140, the proposed first floor extension would not accord with design advice set out in the Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (the SPD). The proposal would result in the infilling of the existing space at first floor level between the appeal dwelling and this neighbouring property.

6. The front elevation of No.140 is set approximately 4.5 metres forward of the appeal dwelling and approximately 3 metres from the boundary between the two properties. However, the proposed side extension would, due to the infill of space at first floor level, result in a terracing effect with this neighbouring property. This would be evident in frontal and immediate views of the appeal dwelling, as well as in longer and more tangential street views of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part and the neighbouring terrace.
7. It is noted that, by being set in from the front elevation of the original house, and the front roof slope of the proposed side extension being set down from the existing main roof ridge, the proposed first floor extension and its hipped roof form accord with design advice given in the SPD. Likewise, the proposed front porch and conversion of the existing garage to habitable space would also accord with the design advice set out in the SPD. These aspects of the proposal would not in themselves result in any harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property. Lack of harm in this instance is, however, a neutral factor in my considerations.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to other existing side extensions in the local area. Little in the way of the planning background was provided. These would, however, have been considered on their own individual merits and I have done likewise in my consideration of the proposal.
9. The appellant has provided me with a drawing of a potential alternative scheme that would involve a two storey side extension set away from the boundary with No.140. This was the subject of a discussion between the appellant and the Council prior to the refusal of the planning application. This does not, however, form the appeal proposal that is before me to consider.
10. On balance, I find that the terracing effect that would be caused by the infill of space at first floor level by the proposed side extension, would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area. This would be contrary to policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraphs 130 and 134 the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions, demonstrate high quality design and integrate with the local area.

Conclusion

11. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR