



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2023

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Date 9 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3314792

78 Boxgrove Road, Greenwich, Abbey Wood, SE2 9JP

- 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 Abdul W Khan against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/2962/HD, dated 5 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a first-floor rear extension and single-storey side porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a first-floor rear extension and single-storey side porch extension at 78 Boxgrove Road, Greenwich, Abbey Wood, SE2 9JP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/2962/HD, dated 5 September 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drg Nos 01, 02, 03, 04/A, 05/A, 06/A, 07/A and 08/A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, end of terrace dwelling with an existing 3.5m deep single-storey, lean-to extension across the full width of its rear elevation. It is located within a predominantly residential neighbourhood and adjoins a wide avenue of grassed public open space with footpath connections across it to other parts of the estate, with a similar pattern of development mirrored on its opposite side. As a consequence, No 78 has a strong visual

- presence, with its side and rear elevations exposed to public view. The proposal includes two elements. A single-storey side extension to accommodate a new porch entrance and a first-floor rear extension.
4. The Council has no objection to the proposed side extension. I agree that it would appear as a modest and subservient addition that would complement the existing dwelling.
 5. The proposed first-floor extension would be 2.7m deep with a further eaves overhang to its gabled roof, set back from the dwelling's flank wall by 500mm, and equivalent to half the width of the house. The proposal follows three earlier planning applications (Refs 21/0007/HD, 21/4164/HD and 22/2255/HD) for similar developments which have all been refused permission for similar reasons. In each instance the appellant has sought to modify the previous scheme to attempt to address the concerns. I note that a subsequent appeal to the first of the three previous applications was dismissed in 2021 (Ref APP/E5330/D/21/3275210) with the Inspector concluding that the scale and bulk of the proposal, particularly when viewed from the side in terms of its depth, would result in bulk which would be over dominant and unsympathetic to the host dwelling.
 6. Unlike the previous appeal proposal, I find that the proposed side recess to the rear extension would sufficiently articulate the building's flank elevation, thereby avoiding the excessive and unrelieved expanse of brickwork that was associated with past schemes. In a similar vein, the shorter depth compared with the existing ground floor extension, and the modest width, would help the addition to appear proportionate with the size of the original dwelling and comfortably integrated with it. The introduction of a gable rather than a hip-ended roof would reflect the gabled-form of the existing terrace and would not, to my mind, appear bulky or incongruous.
 7. I recognise that no other properties within the terrace, or others nearby, are seen to have first-floor extensions, but as an end-of-terrace, the context for No 78 is different to most others. The rear extension would undeniably change the appearance of the appeal property in views from the side and rear. However, I am satisfied that it would do so in a manner that would be in-keeping with the scale and form of the original dwelling without appearing over-dominant or visually harmful. As such, I find no conflict with the aims or objectives of the Council's *Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018*. Neither do I find conflict with Policies DH1 or DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 or Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021 insofar as they require new development, including residential extensions, to achieve high quality design that responds positively to local context through, amongst other things, respect for the scale and appearance of a host building and established development pattern.

Conditions

8. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to ensure that the proposal is finished with materials to match the existing.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of 78 Boxgrove Road, or the wider area. Accordingly, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR