



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3326654

147 Paston Crescent, Eltham, Greenwich SE12 9DZ

- 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 Miss Jennifer Locke against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0885/HD, dated 13 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 9 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side, rear extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side, rear extension and front porch at 147 Paston Crescent, Eltham, Greenwich SE12 9DZ in accordance with the terms of the application 23/0885/HD, dated 13 March 2023, 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: 230305-30A, 230305-20A and 230305-21A.
 - 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.
 - 4) The first floor window to the bathroom in the flank elevation of the development hereby permitted shall at all times be glazed with obscured glass and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor shall be capable of being opened.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace two storey house in a short terrace, set at 45 degrees to and well back from the junction of Paston Crescent and Alnwick Road and with a wrap-around garden. It has a hipped roof with an expressed front gable. At first floor level, there is a set-back from this gable

element to the remaining part of the front elevation above the existing front porch.

4. The appeal dwelling is located in an area made up of similarly scaled terraces, which forms part of a larger planned estate, resulting in a cohesive streetscape. This is not substantially affected by the existing variety of small extensions and alterations, including those to the appeal dwelling.
5. The proposal is for single storey side and rear extensions and a new enclosed front porch. The proposed side extension would be as deep as the existing ground floor of the appeal dwelling, aligning with the existing front and rear elevations. The proposed single storey rear extension would be as wide as the existing dwelling. Both proposed extensions would have shallow mono-pitched roofs. The proposed enclosed porch would sit to the front of the existing dwelling and would align with the existing flank elevation.
6. The design advice in the Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (the SPD) sets out that side extensions should reflect the style of the main house and remain secondary in size and appearance. To achieve this, the SPD also sets out that a side extension's roof pitch should reflect that of the original house.
7. However, the proposed mono-pitched roof would result in the proposed side extension appearing substantially smaller than if it had a more elevated hipped roof matching that of the appeal dwelling. For this reason, the proposed bulk and massing of the proposed side extension would integrate with the relatively small scale of the existing house.
8. The proposed side extension would not be set back from the front elevation of the appeal dwelling. It would align with the existing front elevation at ground level, sitting rearward of the proposed enclosed porch, which would be larger than the existing open porch. The set back front elevation of part of the first floor front elevation would be retained.
9. The design and positioning of the proposed extension would, therefore, accord with the existing scale and compositional arrangement of the appeal dwelling. For these reasons, the proposed side extension would appear as a secondary and subordinate addition to the appeal dwelling.
10. The proposed enclosed porch, whilst being larger than the existing open porch, is not so large that it would be unduly prominent or dominate the appearance of the appeal dwelling. The off centre positioning of the porch door, within the context of this larger symmetrical porch, would not be so discordant to the appearance of the house that it would appear incongruous. Rather the design of the proposed porch as a whole would reflect the variety of porch designs that are evident in the local area.
11. The proposed flat single storey rear extension is limited in depth and, with its mono-pitched roof, matches the design of the proposed side extension. When this is considered in combination with the proposed side extension and porch, the proposed development as a whole would not appear as dominating in views from the street or in rear views from neighbouring properties. Rather, the proposal would appear as subordinate and complimentary to the appeal dwelling.

12. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area. As such, it is in accordance with policies DH1 and DH(a) of the of Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023). These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions, demonstrate high quality design, respond to site context and integrate with the local area.

Conditions

13. Along with the standard condition for the time limit on implantation of the development, in the interests of design quality I have included conditions requiring compliance with approved plans and materials that match those of the existing building. In the interests of privacy, I have also included a condition requiring obscured glazing.

Conclusion

14. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR