



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2022

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18TH AUGUST 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3290859

25 Sidcup Road, Eltham, London SE12 8BL

- 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 R Raghunathan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/3182/HD, dated 30 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey rear and side "wrap around" extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single storey rear and side "wrap around" extension at 25 Sidcup Road, Eltham, London SE12 8BL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/3182/HD, dated 30 August 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: DRG No. 5, DRG No. 6, DRG No. 7 and DRG No. 8.
 - 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.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used the description of development provided on the appeal form in the banner heading above as this more accurately describes the proposal than the description given on the application form.
3. The existing drawings submitted with the planning application show a single-storey rear extension. It was clear from my site visit that this does not exist. This inaccuracy in the drawings has not prevented me from assessing the proposal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 27 Sidcup Road with particular regard to natural light and outlook.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a 2 storey semi-detached house with an attached garage to the side. It is situated in a residential area and forms part of a group of houses of similar age and appearance, many of which have been extended or altered.
6. In 2021 prior approval was approved for a single storey, 4m deep, half-width, rear extension with a maximum height of 3.45m and an eaves height of 2.9m (ref: 21/2092/PNI). This addition would abut the side boundary of the appeal property shared with 27 Sidcup Road. I consider there to be a high likelihood that the prior approval scheme would be carried out if this appeal is dismissed. It is therefore a fall-back position to which I attach significant weight.
7. The appeal proposal would comprise the erection of a single storey, 4m deep, full-width, rear extension with a shallow pitched roof. The flank elevation of the proposal would abut the side boundary shared with No. 27 and would be similar, if not identical, to that approved under the 2021 prior approval. As such the appeal proposal would have no greater impact on natural light to, or outlook from, neighbouring windows at the rear of No. 27 than the fall-back scheme.
8. Having regard to the significant weight I attach to the fall-back scheme, I conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 27. It therefore accords with policy DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018), both of which seek to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers.

Other Matters

9. The Council's second reason for refusal states that the drawings submitted with the application are inaccurate and do not reflect the current condition of the property. Whilst this is the case, the submission of inaccurate drawings is not a matter that results in planning harm or conflict with development plan policies.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider a materials condition is required to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring the approved development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings is imposed.

Conclusion

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

S Poole

INSPECTOR