

# Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 5 January 2021

**by Mr Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 18 January 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3258297**  
**412 Well Hall Road, Eltham, London, SE9 6UD**

- 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 Robert Ledgerwood against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
  - The application Ref 20/1254/F, dated 4 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2020.
  - The development proposed is single storey rear extension (retrospective).
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 412 Well Hall Road, Eltham, London, SE9 6UD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/1254/F, dated 4 May 2020, and the Drawing Numbers B003, B004, P001 Rev B, P002 Rev A and P004 Rev A.

## Preliminary Matters

2. The parties agree that the extension has already been erected and I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
3. I have taken the description above from the appeal form, as it accurately describes the proposal. In the formal decision above, I have removed reference to retrospective, as the act of development is the erection of the extension.

## Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, bearing in mind the sites location within the Progress Estate Conservation Area.

## Reasons

5. The single storey extension has been erected to the rear elevation of the host property. It fills a triangular void between the rear elevations and the boundary but is not vast in its extent. It comfortably sits within the site; its height is well below the level of the first-floor windows and only marginally above the existing boundary treatment. Moreover, it extends for only a portion of the length of the longest rear elevation, set back in from the edge of the dwelling. It thus appears as a subservient and harmonious addition to the property, that does not dominate the property. I accept that a portion of the rear wall has been removed in order to accommodate the extension, however the

proportions and form of the original dwelling, as well as those of its neighbours, remain readily apparent.

6. The appeal site is located within the Progress Estate Conservation Area (the CA). I observed that the significance of this designated heritage asset lies, in part, in the attractive consistency to the design of dwellings, as well as the spaciousness that was apparent within the streetscene. As a consequence of the siting of the extension to the rear of the dwelling and within an area enclosed by two elevations, it is not visible from public vantage points within the street. It has no perceptible effect on the character or appearance of the conservation area, either at this location or as a whole. There is no effect on the streetscene and as such the spaciousness of the CA is preserved. In light of my findings above in respect of the effect of the proposal on the host property, the design elements of the dwelling that contribute positively to the CA would also be preserved. I acknowledge that there is a garage and outbuilding within the site also, but even when considered cumulatively with these, the proposal does not result in the openness of the CA being compromised.
7. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would have no harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, including the Progress Estate Conservation Area. Thus, the proposal accords with policies DH1, DH3, DH(a) and DH(h) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), as well as policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016). Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development is of a high quality design, that designated heritage assets are protected, that rear additions are of a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality, that proposals preserve the character and appearance of a conservation area, that development is informed by the historic environment, that structures complement local character and that development conserves the significance of heritage assets. There would also be no conflict with the guidance to which I have been referred of the Council's Residential Extension, Basements and Conversions Supplementary Planning Document (2018).

### **Conditions**

8. As the extension is already in place, a condition in respect of implementation is not necessary, for the same reason neither is a materials condition. The planning application form indicates that the proposal is complete and as such a condition ensuring adherence to the approved plans is not necessary. I have however referred to the submitted plans in the formal decision.

### **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Martin Allen*

INSPECTOR