



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by N Praine BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3282284

448 Green Lane, Eltham SE9 3TG

- 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 & Mrs Thorne against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/2039/HD, dated 2 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is for the construction of a single storey front extension, new front porch and part one, part two storey rear extension
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single storey front extension, new front porch, and part one, part two storey rear extension at 448 Green Lane, Eltham SE9 3TG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/2039/HD, dated 2 June 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 following approved plans: Proposed Floor Plans 2020-293-003 Revision D, Proposed Elevations and Sections 2020-293-004 Revision D and Site Location Plan.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Dwellings within this part of Green Lane front onto the road with a well-defined building line and generally consistent spacing between the dwellings. The existing dwellings, within the immediate area are broadly two storey, detached with single storey side projections. However, some of the dwellings have been extended above these single storey projections in varying ways.
4. The existing dwellings share architectural design features such as bay windows and hipped roofs and the properties are finished in combinations of render and brick. The formality of the building line, spacing between the properties, and

similarities in design all contribute positively to the character of the area. The appeal property also follows this established character of the area.

5. It is proposed to erect a single storey front/side extension, new front porch, and part one, part two storey side/rear extension. The Council has raised no objection to ground floor front/side extension and porch. Therefore, my decision will focus on the first-floor side and two storey rear extension. I have also had regard to the previous appeal decision¹ in my assessment of this appeal.
6. Part of the development proposal would create a valley in the roof and extend the dwelling to the side, above the garage, at first floor. This element of the appeal proposal has a similar hipped roof design which replicates the 'pyramid' pitch of the host roof. When viewed from the front, the roof has also been subserviently designed with its lower ridge line, significant setback behind the front wall of the host dwelling and substantially set in from the shared boundary with 450 Green Lane. It is also proposed to extend the dwelling to the rear at two storey height with a hipped roof of similar pitch and design as the host dwelling, however, a small section of the roof would incorporate a flat crown.
7. There are examples of first floor side extensions within the street scene at 418, 428, 432, 440, 452 and 454 Green Lane. Though it has taken its design cues from these examples, the appeal proposal would not be as wide as the majority of these examples and would be set further back than most other examples. Therefore, while the appeal proposal would extend to the side space at first floor and introduce a valley into the roof, the substantial setback behind the front wall of the host dwelling and the modest width and significant separation to the shared boundary with No 450, would significantly limit its impact on the street scene.
8. I accept that Policy DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 (the Core Strategy) and its Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance SPD 2018 (the SPD) state that residential extensions should be limited to a scale appropriate to the host building and locality. The extensions to the rear are of considerable size and the Council raises concerns about where the existing and proposed rooflines meet. However, these elements of the scheme will have limited impact upon the character or appearance of the surrounding area given the separation and screening from public viewpoints. Additionally, I have not been made aware that the appeal proposal would breach any specific dimensions set out in policy. The appeal site would retain a generous sized garden and the Council have not raised objection to any impact upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The size of the appeal proposal does not, in itself, generate harm, moreover as I have not identified any harm elsewhere, I find the rear extension both alone and in combination with the other aspects of the development to be appropriate.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would not have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Core Strategy, the SPD, Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) or Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). All of these policies

¹ Appeal reference - APP/E5330/D/20/3250884

and guidance documents seek to ensure high quality design which does not harm the character or appearance of the area.

Conditions

10. I have attached conditions on the time limit for development and plans in the interests of certainty. The materials condition is also necessary to ensure that the development is in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, having regard to the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework and all other relevant considerations, the appeal is allowed.

N Praine

INSPECTOR