



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2019

by David Storrie DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3228138 432 Green Lane, Eltham SE9 3TG

- 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 Siddharth Gotha against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 18/4416/HD, dated 11 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a part one/part two storey side and rear wrap around extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a part one/part two storey side and rear wrap around extension at 432 Green Lane, Eltham SE9 3TG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/4416/HD, dated 11 December 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the description of the proposed development on the decision notice as this more accurately describes the proposed development. From my site visit I noticed that the development had been carried out. Notwithstanding this, I have judged the appeal on its own merits as a proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling facing Green lane set within a row of similar styled houses within a residential area. There is a degree of

uniformity between properties in terms of scale and design, but a number have had extensions, including two-storey side extensions.

5. An extant planning permission exists for *the construction of a part 1/part 2-storey side and rear extension, single storey front extension and installation of one rooflight to north roof slope and one rooflight to south roof slope*, that was granted in April 2018 (reference 18/0582/HD). The development the subject of this appeal effectively amends the approved scheme by making a number of changes. These are notably;
 - The roof over the side extension would 0.2m taller than previously approved;
 - The width of the first floor part of the side extension would be increased so that it would align with the ground floor side extension;
 - The side extension would be set back 3.7m from the front elevation of the main house; and,
 - The garage door would be replaced with a window.
6. The Council also refer to an increase in the depth of the rear extension in the Officer report although I note that this is questioned by the appellant and not a matter raised in the reason for refusal or by any other party, so I have no reason to consider it.
7. Given the extant planning permission, my consideration is whether the proposed alterations to the approved scheme are such that they would make the development unacceptable. Taking the increase in the roof height first, given the set back of the extension from the front of the dwelling and the hipped roof design, the addition would be subordinate to the main roof and dwelling overall. It would also have a ridge height lower than the main roof. Consequently, I do not consider that this change would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the wider streetscene.
8. Turning to the increase in the width of the first floor element, this would bring this part of the extension to within around 1m of the boundary with no. 434 Green Lane whereas the extant permission was set in some 1.7m. Whilst this would close the gap at first floor level between the two properties, a gap would still remain. This gap, which is not insignificant, coupled with the proposed set back of the first floor from the front of the property, would ensure physical separation between the two properties and there would not be a terracing effect.
9. The Council have drawn my attention to similar two storey side extensions at nos. 416 and 418 Green Lane where the set back from the front elevation is 5.7m whilst the appeal proposal is around 3.7m. I have not been made aware of any planning policy that requires a specific distance for first floor extensions to be set back. I consider a set back of some 3.7m to be significant and, for the reasons I have given above, do not consider that the development would give rise to a terracing effect or that both properties would be seen as connected.
10. Finally, on the change from garage doors to a window, this is not a matter of dispute between the parties.
11. Taking all the above into account, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the adopted Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance SPD (2018) that, amongst other things, seek to ensure

that proposals have a high quality of design and to maintain scale and design which creates a positive relationship with the building and locality and that two storey side extensions are designed to avoid a terracing effect with adjoining properties.

Other matters

12. I note the concern from the occupiers of no. 434 Green Lane that the proposed extension would make it difficult to gain access to their soil vent pipe. This is close to the existing side boundary and would be likely to require access from the appeal property to carry out any repairs even if the proposed extension was not built. I consider this to be a private matter between the two parties and not something I can consider in determining this appeal.

Conditions and Conclusion

13. As well as the standard time limit condition, I consider conditions are required relating to matching materials and that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans to provide certainty and in the interests of visual amenity.
14. For the above reasons I allow the appeal.

David Storrie

INSPECTOR