



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2023

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3331354

83 Southwood Road, Eltham, London, SE9 3QF

- 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 James Green against the decision of the Council of The Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application 23/2253/HD, dated 5 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of front porch extension and conversion of garage to habitable room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 3. The property is a semi-detached house in a predominately residential area. Whilst there is a mixed character to that wider area, No. 83 forms part of a small group of houses which have a strong, consistent appearance being red brick tall houses with two stories and gable frontage containing roof accommodation; similar houses opposite in stock brick reinforce that character.
 4. The proposed development would see a front extension across an existing integral garage (which is clearly a later change to the house) and the front door, to create additional internal accommodation and a covered porch area. This would be excessive in scale due to its width and projection from the front elevation, with a design that consequently would sit uncomfortably with the architectural approach and proportions of the original house and its neighbour. The unity of the group of houses would be upset by the change, which would not relate well to the property, and this would be an intrusive feature to both the house and the wider area.
 5. The appellant has drawn attention to extensions at houses to the west. These are houses of different appearance, scale and architectural approach to No. 83 and its similar neighbours, and I do not consider they provide justification for the proposed development. I also acknowledge that the appearance of the ground floor of No. 83 is harmed by the integral garage, but this also does not justify the provision of an extension that itself would be harmful to appearance.
-

6. The Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversion Guidance 2018 (SPD) states that front extension will normally be refused if they are larger than a porch as they may significantly affect the character and appearance of the house and street scene. In this instance I have found that the proposals would represent such harm, and hence my conclusion on the main issue is that the proposal would be contrary to the SPD. It would also conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), which seek to ensure residential extensions are of a scale and design appropriate to the area.
7. I recognise the appellant has sought to address the reasons for a previous proposal on the site being refused permission (ref. APP/E5330/D/23/3318594). However, for the reasons given it is my overall conclusion that the proposed development would conflict with the policies of the development plan, and so the appeal is dismissed accordingly.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR