

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2025

**by D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 28 March 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3354714**

**13 Buckler Gardens, Eltham, London, SE9 3BD**

- 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 Sandra Allen against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
  - The application Ref is 24/2842/HD.
  - The development proposed is the demolition of shed to side and construction of a ground floor side and rear wraparound extension, floorplan redesign and all associated works.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, end of terrace home, fronting a green swathe (Bucklers Gardens) and with its side elevation running alongside a distributor road, Spekehill. The area is of established residential character and the traditional terraced and semi-detached dwellings with spacious roads and local landscape form a relatively regularly planned neighbourhood of pleasing appearance. The proposal is as described above and would incorporate a pitched hipped roof topped with a crown roof.
  4. The Council is concerned that the scheme would fail to complement the established building line and would be excessive in form and inappropriate in design such that the qualities of the existing building and streetscene would be harmed.
  5. For my part I would be less precious than the Council about any precision on this building line as the road is not straight, there are some main elevation variations, outbuildings step forward and frontage parking disrupts long views. Nevertheless, the relevant part of this plot is in a forward-facing main road position and any development should be sympathetic in design and have an air
-

of subtlety so that it would not stand out as alien. Unfortunately, the appeal proposal would not fit these requirements. In all dimensions it would simply appear as too large an adjunct to the original property and the flat roof top would not be reflective of the house or its neighbours. To some degree the higher road level would help reduce visual impact but on the other hand, with levels as they are, the crown roof would be more apparent. Regrettably, on this prominent site this size and design of extension would appear unduly incongruous and would intrude upon the inherent characteristic spaciousness.

6. In all the circumstances the proposed development overall would be harmful to the character and appearance of this property and its locality; the scheme would represent inappropriate design and disproportionate scale for this context.
7. Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) have relevance to the case. Taken together, and amongst other matters, they seek to ensure that development is of high-quality design, sympathetic to its surroundings and integrating in the streetscene, suitable in form for its context, and protective of visual amenity. This is reflected in the advice and objectives of the Councils Urban Design Guidance SPD (2023) (SPD) albeit that document cannot be expected to cover every eventuality in design or dimension terms. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the relevant development plan policies and the pertinent aims of the SPD.

#### *Other matters*

8. I understand the wish to enlarge this dwelling, and moves to optimise this site, and I appreciate that the scheme would bring benefits to occupiers. I recognise that a constructive approach has been taken to seek to overcome previous refusals of planning permission but regrettably this is not to a sufficient degree. I can see that thought has gone into matters such as materials and windows and trying to create subservience, but overall, the scale of the massing and the nature of the roof form would remain problematic to my mind. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant, but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
9. The National Planning Policy Framework has been considered and the development plan policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

#### *Overall conclusion*

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

*D Cramond*

INSPECTOR