



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 April 2023

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3316606

5 Haimo Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 6DZ

- 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 Alex Iwuoha against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/4031/HD, dated 8 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a first floor side extension at 5 Haimo Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 6DZ in accordance with the terms of the application 22/4031/HD, dated 8 December 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The window to the first floor bathroom on the development hereby permitted shall at all times be glazed with obscured glass and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor shall be capable of being opened.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the description of the proposed development varies between documents submitted for the purposes of this appeal, I have used the description from the Council's decision notice, as this is concise, accurate and has been used by the appellant for their appeal statement.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi-detached house with good sized front and rear gardens, with the front garden area given over to parking. There is an existing single storey wrap around extension, which covers part of the ground floor of the front of the original house and the full depth of its flank elevation and the full width of its rear elevation. A side passage, approximately 1 metre wide, connects the front and rear garden areas of the appeal dwelling. This sits between the flank of the existing side extension and the boundary with the neighbouring end of terrace house at 4 Haimo Road (No.4).
5. The detached pair, of which the appeal property forms part, sits between two short runs of terraced houses. This combination of terraced and semi-detached houses, evident on this side of Haimo road, reflects the make up of residential properties in the local area, which forms part of a larger planned estate.
6. The proposal is to extend the appeal dwelling at first floor level by adding a floor above the side part of the existing wrap around extension. This would align with the side elevation of the wraparound extension and the rear elevation of the main house but would be slightly set in from its front elevation. It would reflect the design and fenestration of the existing dwelling, including by replicating its hipped roof form, which would be slightly set down from the existing roof ridge.
7. The Council's officer report states that the proposal would bring the entire flank wall of the dwelling up to the site boundary. However, the proposed first floor extension would align with the flank wall of the existing wraparound extension, and this is set in approximately 1 metre from the boundary of the appeal property with No.4.
8. The proposal would also be set in from the front elevation and its complimentary hipped roof would be set down from the existing roof ridge. In these regards the proposal would accord with the design advice given in Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) for such extensions.
9. For these reasons, in both immediate and in longer street views, the proposal would appear as a subservient addition to the appeal dwelling and not as a dominant or uncharacteristic one that would unbalance the semi-detached pair of which it forms part. Due to the proposal maintaining and matching the 1 metre separating gap of the existing side passage, between the flank of the appeal dwelling and No.4, the proposal would not result in a terracing effect with this neighbouring property.
10. I find, therefore, that the proposed development would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area.

Conditions

11. Along with the standard condition relating to the timing of implementation, I have attached conditions to ensure design quality, which along with the required compliance with the approved drawings, further requires that materials used for the proposal match those of the host dwelling. To protect privacy, I have also imposed a condition relating to the glazing to the bathroom window in the side extension.

Conclusion

12. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR