



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3327793

60 Mayday Gardens, Kidbrooke SE3 8NW

- 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 Singh against the decision of The Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0361/F, dated 2 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side and partially rear first floor extension and a porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi-detached house with a hipped roof. To the side is an existing attached single garage and to the rear an existing single storey extension. It is located in an area of similar semi-detached properties, many of which appear to have been the subject of extensive alteration and extension.
4. The first floor element of the proposal would wrap around the rear corner of appeal dwelling. It would extend across approximately 2 metres of both the rear and flank elevations, rearward by approximately 1.9 metres and would be set in approximately 1 metre from the boundary of the appeal dwelling with 62 Mayday Gardens (No.62). This would be topped with a short crown roof form, that would reflect the angles of the existing hipped roof of the appeal dwelling.
5. This first floor element of the proposal would be visible from the street, as well as from the rear of the property. In these views from both the public and private realms, the shape, scale of the proposed first floor extension, along with the massing of its short crown roof, would result in it appearing to be over scaled and to not reflect the architectural design of the appeal dwelling, to which it would sit in contrast. This would result in it appearing as a dominating and unduly apparent addition, which would be poorly integrated with the appeal dwelling.
6. The single storey element of the proposed extension would extend the existing single storey rear extension that is currently almost the full width of the original house, and only slightly set back from the boundary of the appeal dwelling with 58

Mayday Gardens (No.58). The single storey element of the proposal would keep just over half of the existing rear extension closest to No.58. It would also extend rearwards and sideways to align with the rear extension at No.62 and would wrap around the flank of the house to connect with the existing garage, which would be changed to provide an additional bedroom. The front the existing garage would extend forward, losing its door and would form part of an enclosed front porch structure with a mono pitched roof.

7. The ground floor element of the proposal would have a limited effect on the appearance of the appeal dwelling from the street and would appear to reflect some of the more contextual and successful porch extensions in the local area. From the rear the proposal would mirror the flat roofed form and scale of neighbouring and nearby extensions.
8. For these reasons, the first floor element of the extension would result in the proposal as a whole appearing to be an overbearing and incongruous addition to the appeal dwelling. This would be evident in wider and immediate views from both the front and rear. Whilst there are significant numbers of two storey extensions in the area, some of which the appellant has brought specially to my attention, these appear to be of some age and to be poorly designed and integrated with their host dwellings. The resulting harm to the character and appearance of the local area, through such extensions would, therefore, only be added to by the proposal.
9. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area. This would conflict with 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.
10. I acknowledge that the appellant received positive pre-application advice on the appeal proposal. However, in my experience, pre-application advice is usually given without prejudice and cannot pre-determine the outcome of a subsequent application. In any case, I have agreed with the Council's reason for refusal and conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.
11. I also acknowledge that the proposal would result in a larger dwelling with 2 additional bedrooms, however, it is not likely to be the only way that such a primarily private benefit could be achieved. Planning decisions are generally made in the public interest, and, in this instance, I find that these benefits do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

12. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR