
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: 1st December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/16/3160615
43 Cradley Road, Eltham, London SE9 2HD

- 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 Miss F Jackman against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 16/1389/F, dated 29 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and two storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and a two storey side/rear extension at 43 Cradley Road, Eltham, London SE9 2HD in accordance with the terms of application Ref 16/1389/F, dated 29 April 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 plans: 16/43/1; 16/43/2; 16/43/3; 16/43/4; 16/43/5.
 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 43 Cradley Road is a two-storey, semi-detached house built in a 'chalet' style with a gable to the front and a long catslide roof and low eaves. The site lies in a pleasant, well-established residential area comprising a mix of semi-detached houses of a variety of styles, including properties with hipped and catslide roofs, and terraced properties with hipped roofs. Many of the properties have been extended since they were originally built.
4. The proposal seeks to extend the property by means of a single storey rear extension and a two-storey side extension. No objection has been raised by

the Council to the single storey extension and, given its scale and form, and position adjacent to a similar extension at the neighbouring house, I have no reason to disagree.

5. The proposed two-storey side extension would be set some 1.7m back from the frontage of the building and would project beyond the rear elevation by around 3m. It would have a partly flat and partly hipped roof and a higher eaves line than the existing property. Materials would match the existing dwelling.
6. The proposed extension represents a sizeable addition to the existing dwelling, and its form, particularly that of its roof, differs substantially from that of the host dwelling. However, the extension would be set back from the frontage and down from the existing ridge height, allowing the form of the original catslide roof and distinctive gabled frontage to be read and understood. In terms of its width, the extension would be around half the width of the existing property and as such would not be disproportionate. In addition, the proposal would meet the criteria for extensions set out in Policy DH (a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy, specifically, that it has been designed to avoid a terracing effect and that the flat roof would not be visible from the public highway.
7. Moreover, the adjoining semi, No 41, has itself been substantially altered by way of an extension at first floor level. This extension, which lies flush with the front elevation, has a high eaves line and runs along the side of the property obscuring much of the original roof form. Accordingly it has substantially altered the profile of that property thereby affecting both its own appearance and that of the pair as a symmetrical whole. In this context, the proposal would not cause significant harm to the character of the property or the appearance of the pair. Whilst the proposal would extend the footprint of the building, for the above reasons it would nevertheless respect the character and appearance of the original dwelling.
8. Properties in the area are generally built on a distinctive building line although there is no particular rhythm to the street scene because of the variety in building styles and spacing between the properties. The set back of the extension from the frontage would ensure that it would not be an unduly prominent feature and, in addition, its hipped roof form would be similar to that of the adjacent terrace. Whilst I accept that the extension would project beyond the existing rear elevation, this would not be apparent in the public realm. Moreover, it would project a similar distance as the extension to the adjacent terraced house and is therefore appropriate.
9. For these reasons the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area. As such it would be in accordance with the provisions of Policies DH1 and DH (a) of the Core Strategy which seeks to ensure that development is of a high quality that respects its context, and the provisions of Policy 7.4 of the London Plan which requires development to have regard to the form and structure of an area.

Conditions and Conclusion

10. 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.

11. 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