
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2024

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3338277

62 Corelli Road, Kidbrooke, London SE3 8ER

- 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 Karabacz against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 23/2638/HD, dated 10 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension and 2-storey side extension with internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension and 2-storey side extension with internal alterations at 62 Corelli Road, Kidbrooke, London SE3 8ER in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/2638/HD, dated 10 August 2023, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house within a predominantly residential area wherein properties vary in design, size and general appearance. I saw that the property attached to No 62, which is 60 Corelli Road, has been extended and externally altered on all 3 sides. These changes, which are not shown on the submitted plans, have diminished the general symmetry and sense of balance between these dwellings as a matching pair.
4. The Council has recently granted planning permission for a single storey extension at the side of No 62, which I shall refer to hereafter as the approved scheme. As the proposed 2-storey side extension would be taller and more substantive in-built form than the approved scheme, it would be a more prominent feature in the local street scene.
5. Nevertheless, like the approved scheme, the proposed side extension would be noticeably set back from the main front wall with a dual pitched roof and a gable end to broadly match the main house. The new addition would be less than half the width of the existing principal elevation with a ridgeline and eaves set down from those of the host building. The proposed external materials

would also match those of the existing dwelling. These arrangements would achieve a subservient and sympathetic form of new development that is supported in the Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

6. The appeal scheme would result in a larger property with a wider 2-storey front elevation relative to its attached counterpart. However, unlike the appeal dwelling, I saw that No 60 includes a single storey side extension, a front porch with the gable facing the road, dark-framed windows and entrance door, and plain rendered walls. Given the notable contrast in the existing built form and general appearance of Nos 60 and 62, the introduction of a 2-storey side addition, as proposed, would not unduly disrupt or unbalance their principal elevations.
7. The new first floor front windows would not align with those in the existing front facade. However, no visual disharmony would result. The proposed windows would be similar in size and style to their existing counterparts and their lower position, although unconventional, would be broadly consistent with the roof lines that are also set down from those of the host building
8. With the new built form in place there would be insufficient space around the side of the new extension to allow direct access from the road to the back garden. Even so, the approved scheme includes a similar arrangement, which the Council has presumably found to be acceptable. As such, I find that a conflict with one part of the Council's SPD, which advises that an access walkway should be retained where this is an established feature of the local area, insufficient to withhold planning permission.
9. At the rear, the new single storey extension would be wider than the host building. It would also connect with the proposed side addition to significantly enlarge the built footprint of No 62 and noticeably add to the scale and mass of the dwelling. Even so, the new rear addition would essentially replicate a similar extension at the back of No 60 and a good-sized back garden would be retained with the new built form in place. With adequate space around the completed building on all 3 sides, it would continue to stand confidently within its generous plot with no strong sense of overdevelopment.
10. I saw several examples of properties within pairs in the local area that have been extended and altered without detriment to the character and qualities of their streetscape or the local area. Given that varied context, and the changes that have already taken place in relation to No 60, the proposal would not be an uncharacteristic addition, nor would it not look out of place.
11. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed side extension would not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building or the local area. Accordingly, it does not conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan or Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies. Together, these policies require that all developments achieve a high quality of design by requiring that proposals for residential extensions are limited to a scale and design that is appropriate to the building and locality. While there would be a conflict with part of the guidance within the Council's SPD, the overall design would remain secondary to the host dwelling in accordance with a key principle of this document.

12. The proposal would also be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as it requires development to achieve a high standard of design and be sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is imposed to require that the external materials match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

14. Overall, there are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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 plan: Refs 185/01, 185/03, 185/31 and 185/32.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.