

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2024

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3328797

19 Leonard Robbins Path, Thamesmead SE28 8ED

- 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 Mykola Turyanskyy against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 23/1778/HD, dated 26 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is for a ground floor front extension and relocation of the entrance door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor front extension and relocation of the entrance door at 19 Leonard Robbins Path, Thamesmead SE28 8ED in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/1778/HD, dated 26 May 2023 subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Site Plan, 03, 04, 12, 13 and 14.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') was published in December 2023, but there are no material changes relevant to the substance of the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a three storey terraced house which in part constitutes a link at first and second floor levels to the block that comprises nos 7 – 18 Leonard Robbins Path, and being attached to the latter. The principal

elevation of the host dwelling is set back behind nos 20 – 22 (evens) adjacent and has a tapered front garden boundary. The extension would essentially infill the recessed area of the front garden and overall would appear subordinate in form to the host dwelling. I also noted on my site visit that there are a number of other single storey projections in close proximity to the appeal proposal, specifically those constituting nos 3 – 6 Leonard Robbins Path opposite, with substantially larger flat roof elements. Consequently, I consider that by virtue of its modest proportions and its discreet siting that the proposal, by reason of its layout and scale, would not erode the original character or appearance of the site, nor would it be out of keeping with the street scene.

5. The Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Guidance (December 2018) states that front extensions will normally be refused if they are larger than a porch because they stand out, look bulky and can significantly adversely affect the character and appearance of the house and street scene. Ultimately however each case must be assessed on its own merits, but the SPD goes on to state that where the front of the house is staggered in an 'L' shape a small front extension may be possible, they should not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. I find no material conflict between the scheme before me and this guidance. It may well be that none of the appeal dwelling's typology have been altered by a similar development to that proposed, however that in itself is not a reason to withhold planning permission.
6. I therefore find that the proposal would protect the character and appearance of the area and complies with Policy D3 of the London Plan (March 2021) and Policies DH1 and DH (a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014) which together require all developments to make the best use of land by following a design-led approach and optimise the capacity of sites, ensuring that all developments are of a high quality of design by providing a positive relationship between the proposed and existing urban context and requiring proposals for residential extensions to be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality.

Conclusion and Conditions

7. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
8. Other than the standard time limit condition, the Council has suggested a condition requiring external materials to be used in the construction of the extension to match those of the existing building, and that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I consider these conditions necessary in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the area.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR