



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022 by C Glaister BSc (Hons)

Decision by A McCormack BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3291681

80 Chapel Farm Road, Eltham SE9 3NQ

- 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 Mrs Sandie Adgie against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/3690/HD, dated 2 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey side extension with front porch and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey side extension with front porch and rear extension at 80 Chapel Farm Road, Eltham SE9 3NQ in accordance with the terms of application Ref 21/3690/HD, dated 2 September 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: BL/DRG/230920/01 (Site Location Plan), BL/DRG/230920/02 (Site Plan) and BL/DRG/230920/04 (Proposed Drawings, Proposed Layouts and Elevations) (all dated 23/09/20).
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The property is one half of a two-storey semi-detached pair. It adjoins Lavidge Road and is surrounded by properties of a similar appearance. Single-storey side extensions and front porches are common in the area. Many are attached

to one another, and some also extend past the rear elevation. Whilst there are differences in how they are designed, such as in their size and roof form, extensions of this general nature have become part of the character of the area. No 82 Chapel Farm Road adjoins the opposite side of Lavidge Road. It has a side extension with a flat roof that immediately adjoins the pavement on Lavidge Road, and an associated porch.

5. In regard to the proposal, the porch would also connect to the side extension. The side extension would extend beyond the rear elevation of the property and would come very close to the boundary with Lavidge Road. The front elevation of the development would have a pitched roof, and the rest of the roof would be flat. The development would be very similar in appearance to the other extensions identified in the area.
6. The development would appear well integrated amongst extensions of a similar kind and would appropriately reflect the established characteristics of the area. It would be subordinate to the original dwelling and avoid harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be similar in height to the extension at No 82, and due to the width of Lavidge Road, including the pavement, and the minor setback from the boundary, it would avoid appearing dominant.
7. The Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (December 2018) (SPD) provides guidance on the design of residential extensions. It suggests that the roofs of side extensions should reflect the roof pitch of the original house. It also suggests that side extensions should normally be set back slightly from the front wall of the house and that the width should be less than half the width of the main house.
8. Whilst much of the roof would be flat, and this would differ from the hipped roof of the main dwelling, it would be reflective of other extensions on the street, including at No 82, which also differ from the roof of the original dwellings. It would in this respect be acceptable. Similarly, a side extension extending beyond the front elevation and connecting to a porch is also a common feature in the area.
9. Although the side extension and porch are connected, the width of the development on the side elevation of the house would not exceed half the width of the original dwelling. The proposed development is indicated to be constructed using matching external materials to that of the host building. As a result, it would not be harmful to its overall character and appearance. Moreover, it would remain sympathetic to the other extensions of a similar nature that are prevalent on the street. Therefore, despite some conflict with the guidance given in the SPD, the development would be acceptable, and no harm would arise.
10. For these reasons, the development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, or the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) which together seek to ensure: development achieves a high quality of design; proposals for rear, side and other additions are limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality; and development responds to the existing character of a place.

Conditions

11. As standard, conditions relating to the commencement of the development, and that the development adheres to the plans submitted, in order to provide certainty, are recommended. A condition ensuring the external materials match the existing building would be necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

C Glaister

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

A McCormack

INSPECTOR