



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/23/3315534

20 Scotsdale Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE12 8BP

- 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 Cathy Wade against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/3533/HD, dated 20 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey side and wrap around extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a single storey side and wrap around extension at 20 Scotsdale Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE12 8BP in accordance with the terms of the application 22/3533/HD, dated 20 October 2022, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

2. As the description of development varies in documents submitted for the purpose of this appeal, I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice, as this is an accurate and concise description that has also been used by the Appellant for their appeal statement.
3. The appeal relates to an application for planning permission for development that has been implemented, therefore the application is retrospective, and I have determined the scheme accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi-detached house with good sized front and rear gardens. It is located in a street of similar houses in a predominantly residential area. It has been the subject of a large rear dormer extension and there is a substantial single storey outbuilding at the bottom of the rear garden, both of which benefit from Certificates of Lawful Development.
6. The appeal dwelling has also been extended by a single storey side and rear wraparound extension. A planning application for a similar extension was

approved by the Council¹, however, the extension as constructed projects 0.4m further rearward than that approval. The appellant subsequently submitted an application for the extension as built, and this extension is the subject of this appeal.

7. The appeal dwelling and its rear garden are generously proportioned, and there is an original or early single storey outshoot to the rear. The appeal extension extends approximately 3.1 metres beyond the rear wall of this outshoot and 6.8 metres rearward of the rear elevation of the main house.
8. The previous approval for a wraparound extension would have resulted in an extension projecting rearward from the appeal dwelling that would have aligned with an approved and implemented rear extension to the neighbouring property at 22 Scotsdale Road (No.22). However, as built, the single storey wraparound appeal extension projects beyond that by approximately 0.4 metres.
9. It is important to note, however, that the building line on Scotsdale Road is not consistent. Due to a crank in the building line at this point, No.22 sits further forward on its plot by approximately 0.5 metres than the appeal dwelling, resulting in a step forward in the building line.
10. The design advice set out in the Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (the SPD) states that rear extensions should not project more than 3.6 metres from the rear wall of the original house. However, this design advice is guidance that should be applied with reference to individual context and circumstances.
11. The presence of the existing rear outshoot, the generous scale of the appeal dwelling and its rear garden and the crank in the street frontage of Scotsdale road are all material contextual factors. Although the wrap around extension projects further rearward than the rear extension at No.22, it would project approximately 3.5 Metres rearward of the existing outshoot. As such the appeal extension follows the pattern of development on the appeal site and at this point in the street.
12. Street views of the appeal extension are limited to the front elevation of the side part of the single storey wraparound extension and its small area of pitched roof, where it aligns with the front elevation of the main house. From the rear, the wraparound extension appears as a flat roofed addition that is seen in the context of a variety of rear extensions of varying design and scale, especially the rear extension at No.22. Within these views the appeal extension appears to reflect the character and appearance of its context.
13. These factors lead me to find that the extent and scale of the appeal extension does not result in it appearing to have an excessive depth that results in it appearing as a bulky and dominant addition, nor to overwhelm the character of the appeal dwelling. Rather the appeal extension appears as a proportionate single storey side and rear extension, which appears as a secondary and subordinate addition to the appeal dwelling that reflects its established character.

¹ Planning Ref: 20/0491/HD

14. For these reasons I conclude that the side and rear wraparound appeal extension, as built, does not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area.

Conditions

15. The Council have suggested a timing of implementation and materials condition in the event of an allowed appeal. As the development has been implemented and completed such conditions are not necessary and would, therefore, fail to meet the requirements for conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Conclusion

16. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR