

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2016

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23rd November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/16/3160240

23 Chapel Farm Road, Eltham, London SE9 3NJ

- 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 James Schofield against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 16/2039/F, dated 23 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of a side/rear wall extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a side/rear wall extension at 23 Chapel Farm Road, Eltham, London SE9 3NJ, in accordance with the terms of application Ref: 16/2039/F, dated 23 June 2016, and 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 19-21-GREN Rev S1 06.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. Planning permission was granted on 11 April 2016¹ for, amongst other things, the construction of a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension projecting some 3.5m beyond the rear wall of the property. On 16 June 2016, the Council granted prior approval² under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, for the construction of a single storey extension with a depth of some 4m across the rear of the original dwelling only.
3. It is clear from all I have read that the extension applied for would not be carried out in isolation but would be an integral part of what would be, in effect, a wrap-around side and rear extension. I have determined the appeal on that basis.

¹ Application Ref: 16/0158/F

² Application Ref: 16/1408/PN1

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this case are:

- The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area,
- The effect of the development on the living conditions of the adjoining residents, having particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

5. 23 Chapel Farm Road is a two-storey, semi-detached property with a hipped roof, situated in a well-established area of similar properties. The extensions already permitted have been well designed to reflect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. The side extension, which would also have a hipped roof, would be set down from the ridgeline of the main dwelling and away from the side boundary to prevent terracing. The rear extension would be of a simple form and single storey in height. As such the extensions would be subservient to, and reflective of, the character of the host dwelling, and appropriate in the context of the street scene.
6. The addition now proposed would, in effect, square off the rear corner of the two parts of the development. Whilst it would add to the bulk of the development, it would be a small single storey element which would be integrated into the extension in terms of its form and design. In the context of the extended property as a whole, the addition, which would be some 0.5m deep, would not be significant. Consequently, the design and scale of the proposed development would reflect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would not detract from it. Furthermore, the addition would not be visible from within the public realm and would not therefore affect the character and appearance of the street scene.
7. As such, the proposal would comply with Policies DH1 and DH (a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) (the Core Strategy) which seeks to ensure that development is of the high quality that relates to its context, and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan which seek in various ways, to ensure that development respects the character of an area.
8. The Council's 'Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance' Supplementary Planning Document (2016) requires that rear extensions should not normally project out more than 3.6m, if the house is attached, in order to prevent an undue loss of sunlight and daylight to the neighbouring occupiers. Whilst I acknowledge that the addition would have a projection of 4m, some 0.4m above the recommended maximum, it would not lie immediately adjacent to the boundary with the attached dwelling, No 23A. The proposed addition would have no effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of that property.
9. On the opposite side, the boundary with the adjacent semi, No 21A, is currently marked by a timber fence. The addition would be some 1.5m away from that boundary, and given the orientation of the buildings and the limited depth of the addition, any loss of sunlight or daylight it would cause to the property would be limited.

10. I accept that the additional element would be visible from the rear of No 21A, albeit partly obscured by the fence. However, I noticed at my site visit that the nearest ground floor window in No 21A is fitted with obscure glazing. Outlook from this room is therefore already limited. As such the addition would not be unduly overbearing, or cause an unacceptable sense of enclosure when viewed from the main habitable room windows of the adjacent property.
11. For these reasons the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring residents. Consequently the proposal, in this respect, would accord with Policy DH (b) of the Core Strategy which seeks to ensure that there is no unacceptable loss of residential amenity to adjoining occupiers.

Conditions and Conclusion

12. In the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty I have imposed the standard time limit condition and have specified the approved plans. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area I have specified that matching materials are used in the development.
13. For the reasons set out above and subject to these conditions, and taking all other matters raised into account, the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted.

S. Ashworth

INSPECTOR