
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2021

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3265620

6 Glenhouse Road, Eltham, SE9 1JQ

- 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 J Delahunt against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 20/3287/HD, dated 27 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single-storey rear extension at 6 Glenhouse Road, Eltham, SE9 1JQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/3287/HD, dated 27 October 2020, 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: Site Location Plan and Drg Nos 01, 02, 03 and 04.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the date of the decision The London Plan 2021 (LP 2021) was published on 1 March 2021 and is now part of the development plan. The Council's decision notice referred to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2016 (LP 2016), which are now superseded. The main parties for the appeal were invited to express their views on the LP 2021 insofar as it relates to the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 6 Glenhouse Road and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a large, Victorian two-storey terraced house with accommodation arranged over three floors and located within a residential area of similar age and style of properties. It has an original, single-storey outrigger built to one side of the rear elevation and adjacent to the boundary with No 8. I saw from the rear garden at the appeal site that this arrangement is repeated for each of the other properties along the length of the terrace. The proposal would involve the demolition of the existing outrigger and the construction of a single-storey, flat roof extension across the full width of the dwelling to a depth of 4.5m. The roof of the extension would be topped with two, feature glass lantern lights to naturally illuminate the internal floorspace.
5. The Council's *Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018* (SPD), when dealing with single-storey rear extensions, states that it is important for this type of extension to not dominate and for it to remain subservient to the original house. It goes on to state that they should not normally project out more than 3.6m from the rear wall of the original house (if the house is attached) as a deeper extension could block daylight and sunlight for neighbouring properties.
6. The Council has not expressed any concern over the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of either adjoining occupier in terms of daylight or sunlight. No objections from either adjoining occupier were made to the Council when the planning application was considered. Given the existing arrangement of projecting outriggers, I am equally satisfied that the extension would have no impact upon daylight or sunlight to either Nos 4 or 8 Glenhouse Road. The reason stated within the SPD for limiting the depth of a single-storey extension to 3.6m would therefore not be compromised.
7. Whilst the extension would be fairly large, it would be appropriately residential in scale and form, and to my mind would relate comfortably to the size of the original dwelling without appearing dominant or out of proportion. The plot is of a sufficient size to accommodate the extension. It would appear neither cramped nor out of keeping within the context of its rear garden setting. The rooflights would add to the overall height of the extension, but they would be lightweight structures and appropriately recessed from the sides of the addition. They would not significantly add to the visual bulk of the proposal. Whilst other properties along Glenhouse Road may not have been extended to an equivalent depth, this does not preclude the erection of an extension that in my assessment would be respectful of the scale and character of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
8. Overall, I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of 6 Glenhouse Road or the surrounding area. As such, I find no conflict with Policy DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014), which requires residential extensions to be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality, or with Policy DH1, which more generally requires high quality design in all developments. I also find no conflict with LP 2021 Policy D3, which has been drawn to my attention by the Council since the appeal was made as a relevant replacement for LP 2016 Policies 7.4 and 7.6. This requires development proposals to

respond positively to local distinctiveness through, amongst other things, their scale, appearance, and shape.

Conditions

9. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to control the external materials to be used.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR