



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2025

by N Praine BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3346641

24 Whetstone Road, Kidbrooke, Greenwich SE3 8PX

- 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 Marta Sanni against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/0535/HD.
 - The development proposed is described as a 5m single storey rear extension and double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 5m single storey rear extension and double storey side extension at 24 Whetstone Road, Kidbrooke, Greenwich SE3 8PX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/0535/HD 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 external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings: 102 REV A, 105 REV A, A.05 REV A, A.06 REV A, A.07 REV A, A.08 REV A, A.09 REV A, A.10 REV A, A.11 REV A, and the Site Location Plan.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms one half of a pair of two storey, semi-detached dwellings. The wider character of this part of Whetstone Road is defined by some diversity in materials and layout which broadly includes two storey terrace blocks of four dwellings and semi-detached dwellings.
4. While there are gaps between the buildings, some of the dwellings have been extended to the side, at single storey, to both the terrace and semi-detached blocks. Additionally, I noted one existing two-storey side extension at 66 Whetstone Road.

5. It is proposed to erect a two-storey side extension to the host building at the appeal site. It would be set back from the existing front elevation and the ridge line of the proposed roof would be lower than the existing ridge line. A single storey rear extension is also proposed, and this would run along the rear of the host building and the rear of the proposed two storey side extension.
6. I accept that two storey side extensions can have a greater impact upon the street scene when compared to rear extensions. In this case, careful consideration of the appeal scheme including its proportions and its impact on the rhythm of open views between buildings is important. The proposed development takes some of its design cues from No 66. Several of the proposed design features of this appeal scheme also accord with the Royal Borough of Greenwich Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2023, such as its modest width and the setback of the side extension with its lower ridge line when compared to the host building.
7. For these reasons, the proposed development would remain secondary in scale and relation to the host building. Additionally, while the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings would be altered, given the design features set out above, the side extension as proposed would not harmfully unbalance the pair of semis.
8. The proposed side extension would, however, reduce the gap between No 24 and 22 Whetstone Road. In this case, the rhythm of space within the street scene has some variation due to the interchange between terrace buildings and semi-detached buildings offering an interesting contrast within the street scene. The differing proportions of existing buildings and the resultant spacing therefore creates some diversity without harm to the overall proportions of buildings and rhythm of the spaces within this street scene.
9. Setting aside No 66, I appreciate that two storey side extensions are not broadly characteristic of this area. Given the proposed design features as set in the preceding paragraphs, as well as the established street pattern, the proposed side extension would nonetheless add some interest to the character and appearance of the area. This would therefore integrate coherently into the locality limiting any negative terracing effect or loss of open character between buildings.
10. The proposed rear extension would be generous in footprint, and some of its design features do not comply with the SPD, such as the roof line distance from the window sill¹. It would also extend beyond the projection limits set out in the SPD at Principle I.3.3.
11. However, the SPD also sets out that extensions beyond this limit may be considered if neighbourly amenity is not compromised² and that other roof forms can be considered³. In this case the Council raised no objection regarding neighbouring amenity and having reviewed the scale, size, and proximity of the proposed rear extension to neighbouring properties I am inclined to agree.

¹ Paragraph i.91

² Principle I.3.3

³ Paragraph i.92

12. The rear element of the proposal would have limited visual impact from the street scene or any other public vantage point by reason of its position behind the existing dwelling and the proposed side extension. The garden is also of a generous size to accommodate the extension. Given I have found that the side extension would respond appropriately to the streetscape, any harm generated from the proposed rear element of the extension in character and appearance terms would be offset for the reasons set out above.
13. Tying these considerations together, I have found the proposed side and rear extensions to be acceptable. When considered cumulatively the proposed development would be sympathetic to the locality and thus would not harm the layout or spatial character of the area.
14. Therefore, the proposed development would not appear as a dominant, unsympathetic, or uncharacteristic addition. The appeal scheme would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area complying with the relevant provisions of Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021). These, amongst other things, look to promote high quality design which responds to local distinctiveness and legibility of place.

Conditions

15. In the interest of certainty, conditions specifying time, and the approved plans are needed. The details of materials are also necessary to ensure the visual success of this proposed development and its integration into the locality. I have not imposed conditions to control glazing of side windows as no first floor or roof level side windows are proposed.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant considerations, the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

N Praine

INSPECTOR