



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2024

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3350156

10 Haimo Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 6DZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Neil Garnett against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/1931/HD.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description of proposed development from the planning application form although I note it is expressed differently on other documents.

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, terrace and the area.

Reasons

4. The host property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling. The residential development in the area is linear comprising mostly of terraces. There is a uniformity to the scale and appearance of the terraces and separation distances between and around terraces. This creates a distinctiveness to the character and open appearance of the area.
5. The Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2023 requires side extensions to remain secondary in scale to that of the existing building and have a set back of a minimum of 0.5m from the front façade of the existing building. Furthermore, it seeks side extensions to be no more than 50% of the width of the original house. As I see it, this guidance sets out good principles that would ensure additions to the side of dwellings would appear subordinate and proportionate to that of the host dwelling.
6. The two-storey side with single storey front extension would not align with the original frontage of the dwelling as there would be no set back from the frontage at ground floor, rather there would be a projection beyond it. Although there would be a small set back at first floor and a set down of the

- roof ridge, the proposal would not overall accord with the setback required by the SPD. Its proposed width would be a little more than half the width of the original dwelling.
7. The proposed side extension when taken together with the rear extension would be a lengthy extension adding to the cumulative scale of the proposed development. The size and massing would dominate the host property and detract from the character of the original dwelling. It would also unbalance the visual symmetry of the terrace.
 8. The spacing between the terraces in Haimo Road and other neighbouring terraces is characteristic of the area and provides a sense of rhythm and uniformity. The proposal, by creating substantial built development at the end of the terrace, would not maintain the spatial character and the established pattern of development in the area. It would erode the open aspect which is a characteristic feature of these short terraces. This would not respond positively to the character of development in the area.
 9. The side and front extension would be clearly visible within the street scene. The dominant and overwhelming appearance of the side extension, disruption to the symmetry of the terrace and loss of a gap that contributes to the decisiveness of the area would cause visual harm to the host dwelling, terrace and area. Consequently, the proposed development would be harmful to both the character and appearance of the area. The use of matching materials would not overcome my concerns.
 10. My attention has been drawn to extensions that have been allowed at appeal at 5 Haimo Road. From the information provided the concern relating to that development was the creation of a terracing effect, which is not the case here. As such, the development at 5 Haimo Road does not set a precedent for the proposed development at this appeal site.
 11. I have also been referred to other two-storey side extensions in the area, although none of those examples relate to Haimo Road. I am unaware of the full details of the circumstances relating to those cases such as to enable me to judge whether they are directly comparable to this case. It also appears that those planning permissions would pre-date the current London Plan and the Urban Design Guide SPD. This development is in a different location and therefore can and should be considered on its own merits against the current development plan and supporting guidance.
 12. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property, terrace and the area. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014, the Urban Design Guide SPD 2023 and the provision of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies and SPD seek, amongst other matters, development to be of a high quality that should positively contribute to the improvement of both the built and natural environment. Residential extensions should be limited to a scale appropriate to the host building, locality and be designed to respect the established spatial character.

Conclusion

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

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR