



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/21/3274741

27 Appleton Road, Eltham, LONDON, SE9 6NY

- 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 Ting Zheng against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/0378/HD, dated 30 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single-storey rear/side extension, remodelling of the existing side entrance involving a new door and roof to create a covered walkway to the rear extension, and construction of canopy over patio to the rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single-storey rear/side extension, remodelling of the existing side entrance involving a new door and roof to create a covered walkway to the rear extension, and construction of canopy over patio to the rear of the property at 27 Appleton Road, Eltham, LONDON, SE9 6NY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/0378/HD, dated 30 January 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: ET-AP-DRG-021 Rev 1, ET-AP-DRG-022 Rev 1, ET-AP-DRG-023 Rev 1, ET-AP-DRG-024 Rev 1, and ET-AP-DRG-025 Rev 1
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The extensions hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 27 Appleton Road, Eltham, LONDON, SE9 6NY.

Procedural Matters

2. The extensions proposed are largely complete and the application therefore takes the form of a retrospective application.
3. The description of the proposal on the application form is long and includes other related information. I have used a version based upon the description on the decision notice, which is simpler and clarifies the nature of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the extensions on the character and appearance of the area around Appleton Road and Henwick Road.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached house on a corner plot at the junction of Appleton Road and Henwick Road. It has a side extension with a hipped roof, which apparently received planning permission in 2004, and a wide rear extension with a flat roof, which received planning permission in 2017. The original house is set well back from the side boundary with Henwick Road and there remains a good-sized rear garden at the property. From the evidence before me, it would appear that both No 27 and the adjoining No 25 were previously rough rendered. No 27 is now smooth rendered throughout, while No 25 has a smooth render finish with timber detail.
5. At the time of my site visit, the proposed extensions were largely completed. They include an extended front elevation with external door to a covered walkway; a rear extension to the side of the earlier rear extension, shown as a guest bedroom, which projects around 1.2 metres beyond the rear elevation; a further rear extension to the side and rear of the guest bedroom, shown as a kitchen, which projects a further 2.5 metres into the rear garden; and a canopy that projects around 2.5 metres beyond the rear elevation of the earlier rear extension. The guest bedroom and kitchen are rendered to match the rest of the house and have flat roofs. The canopy and side walkway have an open supporting framework and corrugated transparent roofs.
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, side and other 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 side or rear extensions when they would be visible from the public highway.
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 extensions at No 27 would not harm the amenity of adjoining residents, and I concur with that view. The SPD also includes advice relating to corner plots and indicates that where the house is visible from the public highway, the extension should be set back from the boundary by one metre and be proportionate to the dimensions of the main house in order to maintain the open aspect and protect the character of the street.
8. In this case, the Council contends that the extensions, covered walkway and rear canopy, by reason of their individual and cumulative size, scale, massing and design, and when seen in conjunction with the previously approved extensions, result in incongruous and dominant additions to the detriment of the host property and the wider area.

9. The appellant contends that guidance given in the SPD relates primarily to effects of extensions on amenity issues with regard to neighbouring properties. Moreover, he contends that the extensions are not readily visible from the public realm because of their restricted height and design. Finally, he notes that the extensions have been built in order to provide accommodation for a carer for his disabled child. I have sympathy with these views.
10. Although this is a corner plot, the rear extensions and covered walkway are not visible from Appleton Road because of the new front wall extension, which matches the materials and colour of the rest of the front elevation of the house. Furthermore, because the level of the plot is generally a little lower than that of the road level along Henwick Road, the limited height of the walkway and extensions means that they cannot readily be seen from the public highway above the side boundary fence. The extensions are flat-roofed, and conform to the context provided by the earlier flat-roofed rear extension to which they are attached. The earlier extension is also higher than those currently under consideration, and is visible from the public realm.
11. Whilst some minor elements of the design of the various elements of the proposed extensions are not of the highest quality, they are not significant visual features in the area. Moreover, the generous size of the overall corner plot means that the extensions do not occupy an excessive area and the property retains a generally spacious feel.
12. Finally, I note that policy DH1 of the LP indicates that developments should achieve accessible and inclusive environments for all, including disabled people. In this particular and special case, the nature of the disability of the child of the appellant would appear to require the type of ancillary accommodation provided by these extensions. The Council is concerned that the extensions are not accessed directly from the original house, but I note that the guest bedroom has direct access into the rear of the house via the canopy area. In any case, the ancillary nature of the accommodation can be secured by use of a suitable condition.
13. In conclusion, I find that, by virtue of their limited height and visibility, the extensions are not harmful to the character or appearance of the surrounding area. In general, the design and materials used in the key elements of the extensions are sympathetic to the tone and design of the original house and the earlier permitted extension at the rear. In this respect they are not harmful to the character or appearance of the host property. Finally, a relatively generous amount of amenity space is retained around the house and the extensions do not, in this case, represent additions to the dwelling that are detrimental to the property as a whole or to its surroundings.
14. In the light of the above, I conclude that the extensions are not harmful to the character or appearance of the area around Appleton Road and Henwick Road. They would not conflict with Policies DH1 or DH(a) of the LP or with guidance in the SPD.

Conditions

15. 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. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of

the area. Finally, I have attached a condition restricting the use of the extensions to ancillary residential purposes in order to protect the character of the host property as a separate dwelling in its own plot, and to protect the character of the surrounding area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR