



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2020

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3255269

116 Eltham Hill, Eltham SE9 5EF

- 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 Douglas Furlong against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref: 20/0194/HD, dated 21 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is a side and rear first floor extension, second floor loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a side and rear first floor extension, second floor loft conversion with rear dormer at 116 Eltham Hill, Eltham SE9 5EF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 20/0194/HD, dated 21 January 2020, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 116ELTHAMHL/P/A/1, 116ELTHAMHL/P/B/1.
 - 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.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the first floor window on the side elevation as shown on drawing nos: 116ELTHAMHL/P/A/1 and 116ELTHAMHL/P/B/1 has been fitted with obscured glazing to a Pilkington Level 3 or equivalent, and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached house which contains single storey extensions that 'wrap around' to the side and rear. It is located in a row of pairs of semi-detached properties of a similar design, some of which also have single storey side and rear elements. The attached semi to the appeal property somewhat differs in its design as it has a wider front elevation and a greater depth to the 2 storey part of that house.
4. The side part of the proposed first floor extension would be positioned over the existing ground floor side element. Its design would closely follow that of the existing house. The increase in length to the existing main roof ridge would not be out of character as the hipped roof form would be maintained. Where the first floor extension would project around to the rear, it would be over only part of the existing extension and it would be set at a considerably lower height than the original house. Overall, the proposed first floor extension would not be out of scale or appear bulky.
5. The Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD) states that roof extensions should be proportionate to the size of the original house and that full width dormer extensions will be discouraged. The proposed rear dormer would be well set down from the main roof ridge and set up from the eaves level. It would also be partially positioned behind the rear part of the proposed first floor extension. Thus, it would not appear as a full width rear dormer. I do not find there would be a particular conflict with the SPD in this regard.
6. Accordingly, when the proposal is considered with the existing ground floor additions, the larger scale and height of the original house would largely remain intact. The proposed first floor extension and the dormer would be subordinate. Whilst there would be some variation in design to the rear, this is not untypical on residential properties when they are extended. The changes would not be to the extent that the proposal would be incongruous.
7. Turning to the effect on the area, the most prominent addition would be the side part of the proposed first floor extension. It would appear in keeping because it would align the proportions of the appeal property more readily with that of its attached larger neighbour. It would also largely screen the parts of the proposal to the rear. In addition, the proposal would be well set off the site boundary with a recreation ground to the rear. Spacing would also remain with the next property, in terms of the impact on the street character. The proposal would appear comfortable in these surroundings.
8. I conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area. As such, it would comply with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (as amended, 2016) and with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Council's Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) which are concerned with a high quality response to local character and architecture, that developments should positively contribute to the improvement of both the built and natural environment, including a positive relationship between the proposed and existing urban context, and scale and character matters as regards residential extensions, amongst other considerations.

Other Matters

9. The proposed first floor side extension would run broadly parallel to the side of the neighbouring property, the nearest part of which is a single storey side element. The proposed roofline would then angle further back from the shared boundary, so that the effect would not be overbearing. A proposed facing first floor window could ably be obscurely glazed in order to protect privacy levels.
10. The projection of the rear first floor element would be modest and when its siting in relation to both neighbouring properties is considered, it would not unduly affect light levels. The proposed dormer would face over the appeal property's own rear garden, so as to adequately protect the privacy levels of neighbouring properties.
11. Any disruption for neighbours during construction from what is a domestic extension would likely be for a short duration. The effect on property values is not a matter for my consideration. Overall, the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties would not be unacceptable.

Conditions

12. In addition to the timescale for implementation, I have imposed a condition concerning the approved plans for the purposes of certainty. I have also imposed a condition by way of matching external materials to the existing house. This is in order to protect the character and appearance of the area. A condition is also imposed concerning the obscure glazing of the proposed first floor window in the side elevation for the purposes of protecting the privacy levels of the occupiers of the adjacent residential property.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters that have been raised, the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR