
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2021

by J D Westbrook BSc(hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3274252

40 Dairsie Road, Eltham, LONDON, SE9 1XH

- 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 Chris French against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/0733/HD, dated 26 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the demolition of an original single-storey back addition/infill extension and construction of new single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of an original single-storey back addition/infill extension and construction of new single storey extension at 40 Dairsie Road, Eltham, LONDON, SE9 1XH, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/0733/HD, dated 26 February 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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: 40DR/01, 40DR/02; 40DR/03; Site Block Plan; Location Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the area around Dairsie Road.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mid-terraced house situated on the southern side of Dairsie Road. The house has a very long rear garden, which slopes down somewhat from north to south. It has a single-storey rear extension which is described on the application form as original/infill. From my site visit, it would appear that it may well be original, at least in part, since other houses in the vicinity appear to have old extensions across part of their rear elevation.

5. The proposed extension at No 40 would involve the demolition of the existing extension, which projects some 2.6 metres beyond the main rear elevation of the house. The replacement extension would project around 2.4 metres beyond the existing extension, some or all of which may be part of the original house. It would have a flat roof with an off-centre pyramid-type skylight.
6. Policy DH1 of the Council's Local Plan: Core Strategy and Detailed Policies (LP) indicates that all developments are required to be of a high quality of design, and to demonstrate that they positively contribute to the improvement of the built environment. Policy DH(a) deals specifically with residential extensions and indicates that proposals for rear additions should be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality. In addition, such extensions will need to meet certain criteria, including a criterion that flat roofs will not be accepted on rear extensions when they would be visible from the public realm.
7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Extensions, Conversions and Basements (SPD) includes guidance on rear extensions, and indicates the importance of balancing the need for space against the need to prevent an extension from harming the amenity of adjoining residents or the character of the house and local area. In this case, the Council accepts that the extension at No 40 would not harm the amenity of adjoining residents, and I concur with that view.
8. In this case, the Council contends that the proposed development, due to its excessive size, scale, bulk and its setting would result in an incongruous and over-dominant built form which would fail to appear subordinate to the host property and would be harmful to the established local character. The appellant contends that the extension would not be visible from the public highway, and that the Council has recently, in 2020, granted permission for almost identical rear extensions at Nos 18 and 20 Dairsie Road.
9. I note that most houses along this part of Dairsie Road have single-storey, or in certain cases two-storey, rear extensions. While the majority of these are less deep than that proposed at No 40, there are some of similar depth, and I note that extensions 5 metres in depth have recently been permitted by the Council in the vicinity. The proposal at No 40 would not, therefore, appear incongruous. Moreover, the single-storey nature of the extension along with the generous depth of the rear garden means that it would not appear over-dominant, and it would appear subservient to the host property.
10. In the light of the above, I conclude that the extension would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the area around Dairsie Road. It would not conflict with Policies DH1 or DH(a) of the LP or with guidance in the SPD.

Conditions

11. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, and a condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR