



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12.12.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3327338

177 Alnwick Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE12 9BX

- 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 Arturas Reklaitis against the decision of The Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 23/1661/HD, dated 22 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side and ground floor 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 appeal dwelling, the semi-detached pair of which it forms part and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi-detached dwelling that forms part of a planned estate made of similarly scaled semi-detached and terraced properties. It is located on the corner of the junction of the street with a wide cul-de-sac, which also forms an open local green. The appeal dwelling is set at an angle to the corner and forms part of a symmetrical arrangement of houses that relate to the green. Due to the setting back of dwellings from the street, generous spacing between semi-detached pairs, short terraces and the green, the area has an open spacious character.
4. The proposed two storey element of the proposed extension would be set slightly back from the front elevation of the appeal dwelling and would align with the rear elevation. The roof of the proposed 2 storey extension would reflect the existing angles of the hipped roof of the main house, but, due to the front set back, would have a slight set down from the ridge and front slope of the roof of the main house.
5. The Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (the SPD) advises that, in order to be proportionate to the main house, side extensions should be less than half the width of the main house. At a proposed

- approximate 3.2 metres in width, the two storey side extension would, however, be in excess of half the 5.1 metre width of the main house.
6. The width of the proposed two storey side extension and its minimal set back from the front elevation and set down from the roof ridge of the main house, would result in it appearing as of excessive scale and to dominate the appeal dwelling. Further, this excessive scale and dominating effect would also unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair of which the appeal dwelling forms part.
 7. The single storey rear extension would be approximately 3.0 metres in depth and the full width of the appeal dwelling and proposed two storey element of the proposal. The mono-pitch lean-to roof of this part of the proposal would result in it having an eaves height of approximately 2.8 metres and a terminal height of approximately 3.8 metres at its junction with the main house and proposed two storey element of the proposal. At its junction with the main dwelling, and 2 storey element of the proposal, this roof would sit directly under the sills of the first floor windows. The height of the proposed roof and its proximity to these windows would result in the proposed rear extension appearing to be excessive in scale and to dominate the rear of the appeal dwelling.
 8. Given the corner location of the appeal dwelling, the excessive scale and dominating effect of the proposal as a whole would be apparent in views of the appeal dwelling from both the street, cul-de-sac and green, from where it would fail to be a subservient addition to the appeal dwelling. This would result in the appeal dwelling appearing over-scaled and incongruous in relation to neighbouring dwellings and its excessive bulk would detract from the open and spacious character of the local area.
 9. The appellant has drawn my attention to a side and rear extension at 231 Alnwick Road¹. Whilst this does show side and rear extensions can be successfully integrated with their host properties and the local area, the form of this extension, with its subservient front elevation that is set back in two stages, is significantly different to that proposed. As is the location of this property, which has a middle of street location and, therefore, a significantly different relationship with neighbouring properties and local area. I have, therefore only, afforded very limited weight to this in my considerations. Similarly, the appellant has also drawn my attention to a recent approval for an extension at 185 Alnwick Road, however, no further details were provided, and I can afford this only very minimal weight.
 10. Whilst I acknowledge that the appellant has sought to overcome the reasons for dismissal given for the recent refusal of planning permissions² and a dismissed appeal³ relating to proposals that include similar side and rear extensions, I have considered the proposal on its own merits.
 11. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the semi-detached pair of which it forms part and that of the local area. This would fail to accord with advice given in the SPD, which seeks extensions that are

¹ Planning Ref: 00/0892/F

² Planning Ref: 21/1802/H and 22/1481/HD

³ Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3303514

proportionate to the main house and protect the open aspect and character of the street. It would also be contrary to policies DH1 and DH(a) of the 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.

12. The proposal would create a larger house with more living space for its occupants. However, this is a primarily private benefit and planning decisions should generally be made in the public interest and the benefit of the proposal does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR