
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2022

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3288561
221 Green Lane, Eltham, London, SE9 3TA

- 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 Menh Su against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/2704/HD, dated 21 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a Single Storey wrap-around extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a Single Storey wrap around extension at 221 Green Lane, Eltham, London, SE9 3TA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/2704/HD, dated 21 July 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: 2021-221GL-EXT-1 Rev 1.0; 2021-221GL-EXT-2 Rev 1.0; 2021-221GL-EXT-3 Rev 1.0; 2021-221GL-EXT-4 Rev 1.0; 2021-221GL-EXT-5 Rev 1.0; and 2021-221GL-EXT-6 Rev 1.0.
 - 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 is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 219 Green Lane, with particular reference to outlook and light.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling. The proposal is for a single storey rear and side wrap around extension, following the demolition of an existing rear extension.
4. The Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance SPD (2018) (SPD) provides detailed design guidance for various types of residential development. Amongst other matters, it advises that single storey rear extensions should not normally project out more than 3.6 metres from the

rear wall of the original house, as deeper extensions could block out daylight and sunlight for neighbouring properties. The proposed extension would extend beyond the rear of the neighbouring attached dwelling, 219 Green Lane, by about 3.6 metres and the proposal would therefore comply with the guidance contained within the SPD in terms of its depth adjacent to the boundary with No 219.

5. There are windows and patio doors on the rear elevation of No 219. The part of the extension closest to No 219 would have a mono pitch roof with a maximum height of around 3.6 metres, sloping down to a height of about 2.7 metres at the eaves. The boundary with 219 Green Lane is formed by a close boarded fence which sits on a fairly high concrete gravel board with an overall height well in excess of 2 metres. Whilst I note that the proposed extension would be directly to the south of No 219, I consider that due to the height of the existing boundary fence, the modest depth of the proposed extension and its lean-to roof design, any adverse effect on the amount of daylight and sunlight received by the ground floor openings on the rear of No 219 would be minimal. I am also satisfied for the same reasons that the proposal would not be harmful to the outlook from rear windows, or the rear garden of No 219.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a materially harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 219 Green Lane, with particular reference to outlook and light. Thus, it complies with Policy DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and the SPD which seek to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers.

Conditions

7. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area. I have also imposed a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR