The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2023 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3321936
120 Woolacombe Road, Kidbrooke, Greenwich, SE3 8QL

- 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 Bnar Fahme Raheem against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
- The application Ref 23/0434/HD, dated 6 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2023.
- The development proposed is a first-floor rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located on the south-western side of Woolacombe Road within an established residential area characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached properties. The appeal dwelling features an existing two-storey side extension as well as a single storey rear extension and a first-floor rear roof terrace.

5. The appellant argues that the proposal would not create a terracing effect or lead to the loss of the open character between the appeal property and its neighbouring dwellings. However, the proposed rear extension of the hipped main roof by 4 metres would be excessive in the context of the existing property and would appear unduly bulky. Whilst the appellant opines that the proposed roof form reflects the design of the host dwelling, the scale and appearance of the resultant roof would be disproportionate and awkward. It would unbalance the architectural form of the dwelling and I agree with the Council's conclusion that the resultant building would appear top-heavy.

6. The resultant building would also appear incongruous in its surrounding context which is not characterised by rear roof extensions comparable to the scale of

what is proposed. Whilst there are loft conversions and other rear additions in the vicinity, these are smaller and set down from the roof ridge of the building with which they form part. Although the proposal would not impact the streetscene, it would nevertheless still be visible to neighbouring occupiers. It would be read as a discordant addition which would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

7. Given the above, the proposal would conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the *Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies* (2014), the Council's *Residential Extensions, Conversions and Basements Guidance* Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which together seek to ensure proposals are well designed and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area in which they lie.

Other Matters

8. I recognise that extensions to existing dwellings can provide an optimal use of a site as well as providing enhanced and improved levels of accommodation for existing and future occupiers. However, the limited weight that this would attract in support of the proposed development must be considered against the harm which has been identified as a consequence of the proposed design.

Recommendation

9. The proposal would adversely impact the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Given this, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the NPPF, which outweigh this finding.

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

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR