



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2024

by N Perrins BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22.04.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3335067

1 Philippa Gardens, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 6AP

- 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 Amy Knight against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is: 23/3356/HD.
 - The development proposed is double storey side and ground floor rear extension with front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2023 but there are no material changes relevant to main issues for this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one of a pair of two-storey semi-detached dwellings located within a cul-de-sac. The character within the cul-de-sac is residential made up of terraced and semi-detached dwellings. The appeal property is similar in its appearance to its neighbouring dwelling with both properties having open side areas that provide access to the rear.
5. The front porch and side extension would extend forward from the existing dwelling's front elevation by around 1.5m. Whilst there are examples of porches on some properties in the cul-de-sac, these are predominantly small in size and largely contained around front entrances to dwellings. In contrast, the front porch when combined with the side extension would extend across the majority of the appeal property. Furthermore, the front part of the extension going beyond the existing front elevation is contrary to the guidance in the Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2023), which sets out that side extensions should be set back by 0.5m in

recognition that side extensions can have a much greater impact on a street scene than a rear extension.

6. The effect of the ground floor protrusion beyond the existing building line, would create an overly prominent and jarring two-storey development that would appear as an incongruous and discordant addition to the property, which would have an unbalancing effect within the street scene when viewed with its adjoining property. The proposed set back at first floor level would not compensate for this harm to the street scene. The overall size of the proposal to the side would also result in a development that further conflicts with the guidance contained in the SPD for side extensions to be secondary in scale in relation to the existing building.
7. The side extension's width does, however, accord with the SPD in so far that it would be no more than 50% of the width of the original house. Nonetheless, compliance on this aspect does not ameliorate the harm to the character and appearance of the street scene that I have identified from the side extension's overly dominant footprint, bulk, mass and lack of subservience to the host dwelling.
8. I note that the appeal property is at the end of the run of dwellings on western side of the cul-de-sac. However, the property still remains prominent and visible within the street scene as it is one of the first properties seen when people enter the cul-de-sac from its access road. The fact that it is an end property is, therefore, not a material consideration that would outweigh the harm I have identified.
9. The proposal would also remove the existing side access extending to within 0.3m of the side boundary. The SPD advises that side extensions should retain a 1.2m wide access to the rear of the property where this is an established feature of the area. The Council's evidence demonstrates that the majority of properties in Philippa Gardens retain side accesses to the rear as an established feature of the area. The few examples that do not have side accesses to the rear appear to relate to development that took place before the Council's SPD was adopted. Therefore, the proposal's 0.3m gap to the boundary is out of keeping with the established character of the area and contrary in this regard to the guidance in the SPD.
10. The rear extension would be single storey with a depth of around 3.95m and a width of around 9.7m that would connect to the side extension. The depth of the rear extension would be acceptable as it would be consistent with the existing rear extension at No 2 Philippa Gardens. The rear extension, including the part that would connect with the side extension, would not be prominently visible from public vantage points. Accordingly, I find that there would not be material harm from the rear extension either alone or when considered together with the side extension. It would be accommodated comfortably within its plot even with the resulting increase in footprint from the original dwelling to the rear.
11. In summary, the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene due to the front extension protruding beyond the existing front elevation. This would result in an overly dominant side extension that does not accord with some of the specified guidance within the Council's SPD. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policy D3 (*optimising*

site capacity through the design-led approach) of the London Plan (2021), Policies DH1 (*design*) and DH(a) (*residential extensions*) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), which seek to enhance local context, respect the scale and character of the host building, the street scene and the surrounding area. The proposal is also not consistent with the advice within the Council's Urban Design Guidance SPD or Paragraph 135 of the Framework.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal is not consistent with the policies of the development plan as a whole, due to its impact on the appearance of the appeal property and the character of the area, and there are no material considerations that would lead me to a different conclusion. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Perrins

INSPECTOR