



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 July 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3319764

37 Eltham Green Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 6BJ

- 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 Muzzafar Usmanov against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0327/HD, dated 31 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2023.
 - The development is a two storey side and single storey rear extension, ground floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal relates to an application for planning permission for development that has been implemented, therefore, the application is retrospective, and I have determined the scheme accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a two storey end of terrace with a hipped roof. It is located on a long bend in the street, which results in a staggered arrangement of the short runs of terraced houses that front on to it. As a result, the appeal property has a longer than average front garden and the front elevation of the appeal dwelling appears to align with the rear elevation of the neighbouring end of terrace house at 35 Eltham Green Road (No.35).
5. Planning permission¹ was previously granted for the extension of the appeal dwelling, however, the development, as implemented, does not accord with the scheme to which this planning permission was granted. I have, however, considered the development on its own individual merits, which is a main tenet of the planning system.

¹ Planning ref:19/2131/HD

6. The two storey side extension is approximately 2.18 metres wide and as deep as the original house, aligning with the front and rear elevations. It extends the original front roof slope and introduces a half hipped roof form to the side, along with a terminating crown element.
7. The Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) advises that such side extensions should normally be set back from the front elevation and step down from the roof of the original house. The side extension does not accord with this design guidance and, as a result, does not appear to be secondary in size and appearance to the main house.
8. The half hipped roof form, is uncharacteristic of the roof form evident on other end of terraced houses in the local area. As such, this introduces a discordant element into the local roofscape and streetscene.
9. The single storey front extension has a mono pitched roof and is approximately 2.4 metres deep and stretches across approximately half the width of the original house and the full width of the two storey side extension. Front porches are evident in this part of the street and on other houses in the terrace of which the appeal dwelling forms part, however, these are shallower and significantly narrower than the front extension to the appeal dwelling.
10. Due to its width and depth, the front extension does not appear as a subservient front porch but, due to its excessive scale and bulk, appears as an overly prominent and dominating addition to the appeal property, which does not reflect its original character or appearance. This bulk and scale also results in it extending toward the boundary and flank wall of No. 35, which results in a cramped appearance. When considered in combination with the side extension and, due to the proximity of No.35, this causes a terracing effect, which does not reflect the open spatial characteristics of the existing gap between terraces in this street.
11. The single storey flat roofed rear extension is 4.1 metres deep and stretches almost to the full width of the original house and two storey side extension. Given the size of the original house, its location to its rear and the size of the rear garden, this does not appear as excessive in size or to result in a bulky or dominating addition. Rather it would appear to reflect a common type and scale of rear extension evident in the local area.
12. Whilst the application indicates that the materials and finishes to the walls would be cavity walls, the submitted plans indicate that the development matches the existing materials. From my site visit it would appear that the rendering of the development to match the original house is substantially complete. The materials and finishes used also match those of the original house and appear complimentary in this regard.
13. The appellant has drawn my attention to other extensions in the local area. The two storey side extension to 45 Eltham Green Road, located at the other end of the terrace, is set in from the front elevation and down from the original roof ridge and does not, therefore, constitute a precedent for the development or result in a symmetrical appearance to the terrace as a whole.
14. The approved front roof porch at 107 Eltham Green Road, is a mid-terrace house, attached to an end of terrace house that projects further forward. As

such, whilst this porch is deep, its site circumstances, width and prominence do not reflect those of the front porch that forms part of the appeal development. These other extensions would have been considered on their own individual merits and, for the reasons given, I have only afforded these little weight in my considerations.

15. I find, therefore, that, when considered as a whole, the development fails to appear as a subservient addition to the appeal dwelling. Rather, it appears as an incongruous, dominating, unduly prominent addition to the appeal dwelling and terrace of which it forms part. This is evident in views along the street, where its bulk and scale contrast with the existing spatial characteristics of the area.
16. For the reasons given above, the development results in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area. As such, the development does not accord with policy DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraphs 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions, demonstrate high quality design, respect the scale and character of the host building and the street scene, and integrate with the local area.

Conclusion

17. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR