



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 April 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3318594

83 Southwood Road, Eltham, London SE9 3QF

- 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 James Green against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/4160/HD, dated 13 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a front porch and a single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a handsome 2-storey semi-detached house with accommodation within the roofspace. It has a prominent gable and double-storey bay at the front. This is mirrored by the attached house, 81 Southwood Road, which gives the pair a balanced symmetrical appearance, albeit this has been slightly diminished by the garage doors in the front elevation of the appeal property and the front dormer at No.81. The neighbouring pair of houses have a similar symmetrical arrangement. Whilst 79 Southwood Road has been rendered and painted, all four houses have essentially the same form and arrangement of windows, bays and gables and all 4 include characterful tiled canopies above the front doors. These common features give this portion of Southwood Road a relatively unified and pleasant appearance that contributes positively to the overall character of the street scene.
4. The proposal would include a single-storey front addition that would feature a pair of windows, an entrance door and a pitched roof. This would abut the side of the bay resulting in a wholly incongruous relationship between new and original elements. In addition, this structure would disrupt the symmetry of the attached pair of houses and the unity of the group. I therefore conclude that, due to its siting, size and design, the proposed front extension would have an unacceptable effect on the host building and its surroundings.

5. The appeal property has been extended to the rear. A 2-storey infill extension has been added to the rear of the garage and a single-storey addition extends a significant distance beyond the rearmost original wall of the house. The appeal proposal includes a further single-storey extension that would link these 2 elements. This flat-roofed addition would match the height, design and materials of the earlier single-storey element and together these additions would extend across almost the full-width of the house and a significant distance beyond its original rear elevations.
6. The proposed third rear addition would result in an increase in bulk and massing that would dominate, and not remain adequately subservient to, the host property. Consequently, it would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings.
7. For the reasons set out the proposal fails to comply with Policies DH(a) and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) which, among other matters, require a high quality of design, limited to a scale and design appropriate to the locality. There is also conflict with the aims of Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and the guidance in the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018).
8. The appellant has referred to a nearby terrace made up of houses that have ground floor forward projections similar to that proposed at the appeal property. These elements appear to be an original feature of the design of the terrace and contribute to the unity and appearance of the group. The appeal property forms part of a group of houses of entirely different age, design and appearance. I therefore attribute limited weight to the nearby terrace.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR