

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/24/3355289

5 Crouch Croft, Eltham, London, SE9 3HX

- 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 C Coroian against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/1110/HD.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a part one, part two storey side and rear wrap around extension and associated external alterations.
-

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, detached home, on a good-sized plot with its two-storey element abutting its southern side boundary and a gap to the two storey side wall of the neighbouring house on the other. The area is of established residential character. The traditional detached dwellings on the east side of the road, and other dwellings opposite, set with reasonable sized front gardens and all on land rising southwards form a neighbourhood of pleasing appearance. The proposal is as described above.
 4. For the reasons given by the Council I would deem that the works planned to the rear of the house would be acceptable in design and amenity terms. Notwithstanding the Council's comments I would be content that the ground floor side element need not be set back behind the main front elevation of the property. I say this because the gable and two storey bay would continue to be a prominent forward projection and there is some frequency locally in garages and other single storey elements being alongside main front elevations. The property would continue to be read as comparable to its very similar neighbouring dwellings running up southwards on this side of the road. The plot could comfortably accommodate these works.
-

5. Regrettably where I differ from the Appellant is on the question of the first-floor side extension. Unfortunately, this would overly close the gap at the upper level which is such a positive characteristic of the locality and these types of houses in particular. The small planned set-off of the adjoining two storey vertical walling would not be sufficient to my mind and would lean to a terracing effect. The impingement would be exacerbated by the eaves level being higher than the neighbouring home on the appeal property's intended extension. The scheme would simply be too large and too near. A sense of spaciousness and rhythm would be lost.
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 and scale 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 the aims to increase energy efficiency, 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 position and scale of the first-floor side extension would remain problematic to my mind.
9. I viewed other examples of extensions drawn to my attention and others I noticed locally but to a great degree any upper-level side extensions are suitably separated from the nearest two storey wall such that spacing continues to prevail and there is not a terracing effect. On the rare occasion where this is not the case, I would not use those as a benchmark for good design which should necessarily be replicated. In any event I must assess this proposal on its own merits. 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.
10. The National Planning Policy Framework has been considered and the development plan policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

11. 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