



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2023 by A Coombes

**Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 5 October 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3317388**

**3 Rancliffe Gardens, Greenwich, Eltham SE9 6JZ**

- 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 Michael Chapman against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
  - The application Ref 22/3528/HD, dated 24 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2022.
  - The development proposed is a one storey rear extension and two storey side and partial rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a one storey rear extension and two storey side and partial rear extension at 3 Rancliffe Gardens, Greenwich, Eltham SE9 6JZ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/3528/HD, dated 24 October 2022, 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 and the materials specified thereon:

C233-A/(EL)155 Rev P05, dated Jul 22; C233-A/(GA)130 Rev P07 dated Jul 22; C233-A(EL)163 Rev P02 dated Jul 22; C233-A(EL)158 Rev P01 dated Aug 22; C233-D/(EL)656 Rev P01 dated Oct 22; C233-D/(EL)657 Rev P02 dated Oct 22; C233-A/(GA)631 Rev P03 dated Oct 22; C233-A/(GA)133 Rev P02 dated Dec 22.

## 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.

## Applications for costs

3. An application for costs was made by Mr Michael Chapman against the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

## Preliminary Matters

4. The proposal was amended during the application process. For the avoidance of doubt, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the plans considered by the Council and listed on its decision.

## **Main Issue**

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

## **Reasons for the Recommendation**

6. Rancliffe Gardens comprises semi-detached and terraced houses of similar original design. Alterations over the years, such as porches or side extensions, have however given many properties individual character. Some pairs have been extended differently, so are no longer symmetrical.
7. On straight sections of this road and others in this estate, there is a clear rhythm with regular gaps between properties. However, a few properties, including the appeal site, are sited at an angle to the street due to a curve in the road. This creates a wedge-shaped plot that is wider at the rear than the front. Therefore, the gap between the appeal site and the neighbouring pair is wider than, and shaped differently to, most others along the street.
8. Although the proposed extension would reduce the gap between the appeal site and 5 Rancliffe Gardens, the angled relationship means that this would not result in a terracing effect. The remaining gap to No 5 would be comparable to other gaps between pairs in the vicinity and would not harmfully reduce the characteristic spacing between properties.
9. The proposed two-storey side extension would be less than half the width of the original dwelling, set back from the front and have a lower ridge line with hipped roof to match the existing pitch. Whilst a more complicated roof form would be introduced, this responds to the angled site boundary. It has therefore been designed in a way that maximises what can be achieved whilst respecting the context of the plot and the style of the main house.
10. The set back and lower ridge mean the development would appear subservient and secondary to the main house in size and appearance and would allow for the original form of the semi-detached pair to still be read. Consequently, the pair would not appear harmfully unbalanced, particularly having regard to other altered pairs in the area. The angled siting would mean that visibility would be limited only to small areas of the street. Therefore, the side extension would not be prominent or discordant in the street scene.
11. The proposed single storey rear extension would not be visible from the street scene, only from neighbouring properties. The two-storey rear element would also not be readily visible from the road. Nevertheless, cumulatively the proposed development would be large. However, the stepped design would reduce the visual bulk, and in this position at an angle to the road, the overall extensions would not appear bulky. The proposal would be a site-specific design solution that responds to the character of the area, the size and orientation of the plot and makes effective use of the land.
12. Therefore, the development would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area. Consequently, it would not conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), which requires development to make the best use of land to optimise the capacity of sites. Nor would it conflict with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), which together seek high-quality design that is appropriate to the building and locality.

13. The development also responds to the design guidance in the Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance' (2018), which seeks to discourage extensions that harmfully impact on the street scene.

### **Conditions**

14. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, a condition is recommended to ensure that the development accords with the approved plans, as this provides certainty. Materials to match the existing dwelling are necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. This is stated on the plans however, so will be covered by the plans condition and there is no need for a separate materials condition.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out above.

*A Coombes*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and agree with the reasoning set out above. The proposal accords with the relevant development plan policies. On that basis the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

*L McKay*

INSPECTOR