

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2021

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3272942
590 Rochester Way, Eltham SE9 1RL

- 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 D Beadle against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/0184/HD, dated 16 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear single storey rear extension at 590 Rochester Way, Eltham SE9 1RL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/0184/HD, dated 16 January 2021, 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 approved plan Refs. 6533-03 and 6533-08.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The roof of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or amenity area.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a traditional end of terrace dwelling. The proposal seeks to replace an existing single storey pitched roof extension at the rear of the appeal dwelling with a single storey extension projecting 6 metres from the original rear elevation with a flat roof including a central atrium.
-

4. The proposed extension would be slightly wider than the existing extension, spanning the full width of the host dwelling, and according to the undisputed figures provided by the appellant, it would be just under 2 metres deeper.
5. The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document titled '*Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance*' (SPD) explains '*it is important that this type of extension (single storey rear extension) does not dominate and remains subservient to the original house*'. It goes on to say that '*such extensions 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*'. My reading is that the specific 3.6 metre recommendation is primarily aimed at safeguarding appropriate living conditions for neighbours; which has not been cited as a concern by the Council in this case. In any event, the 3.6 metres referred to within the SPD is simply guidance and rather than being slavishly applied, the individual circumstances of each proposal should be considered.
6. In this particular situation, the appeal dwelling is a tall, substantial building. Although the extension would project a significant distance from the original rear elevation, it would be read as a subservient addition. Furthermore, a variety of single storey rear extensions are present within the immediate vicinity, with at least some appearing to exceed the 3.6 metre depth recommended by the SPD. Whilst I do not know the planning circumstances behind these additions, there is no suggestion from the Council that they are subject to enforcement action and they do form part of the established character and pattern of development within the immediate locality.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or that of the surrounding area. In such terms, I find no conflict with the overall aims of policy D3 of The London Plan, policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies or the SPD, which collectively promote high quality design that is appropriate to its context.
8. In addition to the standard conditions which limit the lifespan of the planning permission and direct that development takes place in accordance with the approved plans, the Council has suggested a condition to ensure that the external finishing materials of the extension match those of the host dwelling, along with a condition to ensure that the roof of the extension is not used as a balcony or amenity area. I agree that such conditions are necessary in order to ensure a visually acceptable development and to protect the privacy of nearby residents respectively. I will impose these conditions in allowing the appeal.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR