



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2024

by N Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3330054

24 Porcupine Close, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 3AE

- 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 Agnieszka Zielke against the decision of the Royal borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 23/2190/HD, dated 02 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a side extension (addition of an additional storey over existing converted garage) to create a new bedroom and bathroom on first floor and conversion of existing ground floor wet room and store into a study, utility space and wet room. Rear single-storey extension to create open plan kitchen/dining space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Revised versions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for the appeal. I have had regard to the latest version of the Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

4. There are some two storey side extensions to properties within this street scene. However, in general the dwellings are unaltered and there is a consistency to the character and appearance of the street scene along the appeal side of Porcupine Close. The hipped roof forms remain discernible and these form a key characteristic of the street scene.
5. The side extension would be higher than the existing eaves at the side of the property. As such, the proposal would not appear as a subservient addition to the original dwelling. It would be a bulky and unsympathetic addition to the property. Furthermore, the roof form, incorporating a steep mono-pitch with uncharacteristic dormer to the front, would appear out of keeping with the other roof forms within the street scene.

6. Taken collectively, the overall size and design of the side extension, along with its height in excess of the existing eaves of the host dwelling, would result in an addition that would detract from the appearance of the host property and the street scene. It would also create a visually unbalancing appearance to the pair of semi-detached properties. Consequently, I find that the proposal would be visually harmful. This visual harm would be clear in public views, particularly on the entry approach along Porcupine Close. Having a set back from the existing frontage and being constructed with matching materials and fenestration, alongside being less than half the width of the existing dwelling, would not overcome the visual harm that I have identified.
7. No 11 Porcupine Close has received planning permission for a two storey extension that has been completed. However, that development relates to a different street scene at the end of the cul-de-sac. It is advised that No 17 Porcupine Close has received planning permission for a side extension in 2018. The details provided show that proposed extension to be of a different pitched roof design to that proposed here. I note that properties Nos 4 & 5 Porcupine Close host large flat roofs attached to the main houses, albeit those properties are on the opposite side of Porcupine Close where there is a different character to the street scene. I am also directed to a two storey residential development close by that is currently under construction. However, that development does not form part of the Porcupine Close street scene. It is also pointed out that two properties have large loft conversions visible from the street.
8. Whilst it is clear there are other examples of side extensions and other developments in the area, some of which appear to be historic, none are directly comparable to the design of the side extension that is proposed here. Therefore, this proposal can and should be considered on its own merits.
9. For these reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan, Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPD) and the provisions of the Framework. These policies and SPD seek, amongst other matters, development to be of high quality design, to positively contribute to the improvement of both the built and natural environment, respond to local distinctiveness and to be of a scale and character that respects the host building, the street scene and surrounding area.

Other Matters

10. Some concern has been raised to the Council's handling of a previous planning application and pre-application advice. However, these are matters that, if necessary, should be raised with the Council away from this appeal. In any event, these concerns would not lead me to alter my findings above.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR