



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2023

by R Major BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3326021

27 Glenesk Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 1AG

- 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 Martin Anderson against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 23/1619/HD, dated 20 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2023.
 - The proposal is described as "*extension of existing outbuilding with pitched roof as existing and materials as existing for use incidental family use and enjoyment of the dwelling*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension of existing outbuilding with pitched roof as existing and materials as existing for use incidental to the family use and enjoyment of the dwelling at 27 Glenesk Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 1AG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/1619/HD, dated 20 April 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Location Plan (Scale 1:1250)
 - Block Plan (Scale 1:500)
 - 301 – Proposed Plans and Elevations
 - 3) No materials shall be used on the external surfaces of the proposed development other than those referred to on the approved plans (dwg ref: 301 – Proposed Plans and Elevations).

Main Issues

2. The Council's Decision Notice includes one reason for refusal, however in light of the contents of the Council's Delegated Report, I have included a second main issue. Consequently, the main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 38 Greenholm Road, with regard to outlook; and

- the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing outbuilding, the host dwelling and the surrounding area;

Reasons

Effect upon the occupiers of number 38 Greenholm Road

3. Number 38 Greenholm Road (number 38) is located to the rear of, and shares a rear boundary with, the appeal site. I observed on site that the shared boundary is defined by a brick wall with a trellis fence above, and number 38 has a detached shed situated close to this shared boundary.
4. The proposal seeks to extend the width of the existing outbuilding and alter the existing roof of the outbuilding from a pitched to a hipped roof design. The proposed extension would result in the outbuilding extending across almost the full width of the rear boundary of number 38, and it would therefore be visible from the openings in the rear elevation of this neighbouring property, as well as from its rear garden area.
5. Number 38 has a relatively long rear garden, and a sufficient separation distance would be retained between the rear elevation of this neighbouring dwelling and the extended single storey outbuilding. As a result of this separation distance, and the height of the outbuilding, the extended outbuilding would not have a harmful impact upon the outlook of the occupiers of number 38, when viewed from the openings in the rear elevation of this neighbouring dwelling.
6. With regard to views from the rear garden area of number 38, part of the existing pitched roof outbuilding is already visible from this area. However, it is acknowledged that the extension would result in more of the outbuilding being visible from this neighbouring garden. Nevertheless, as a result of its single storey massing, and the alteration from a pitched to a hipped roof design, the impact of the appeal proposal would be minor and not detrimental to the outlook from this neighbouring garden, nor would it result in any significant overbearing impact.
7. I acknowledge the interested party's comments in respect of there being no apparent need for the height of this building, and that it could be constructed with a flat roof to reduce the visual impact and avoid the need to have an adjacent tree cut back. However, the appeal proposal must be determined as submitted, and for the reasons detailed above I have found no undue harm arising from the proposal.
8. In view of all the above, I conclude that the appeal proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of number 38 Greenholme Road by way of loss of outlook. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), which only permits development that does not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers by reducing the amount of daylight, sunlight or privacy they enjoy, or result in an unneighbourly sense of enclosure.
9. Furthermore, I find no conflict with the Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversion Guidance (2018), insofar as it seeks to ensure that the immediate

outlook from neighbouring windows does not become unsightly, or appear overbearing, as a result of a development proposal.

Character and appearance

10. Whilst not included as a reason for refusal, the Council's Delegated Report states that the scale, design and the relationship between the proposed enlarged outbuilding and the host dwelling would be unacceptable. Furthermore, the report states that the use of timber cladding would not be considered appropriate as it would not match or respect the character of the existing outbuilding, the host dwelling or the surrounding area.
11. The proposed enlargement to the outbuilding would result in an increase in its width and a very minor alteration to its overall ridge height, as well as a change from a pitched to a hipped roof design. Nevertheless, the enlarged outbuilding would remain single storey so as to continue to be subservient to the large two storey host dwelling, and the alteration to a hipped roof design would reduce the massing at roof level in comparison to a pitched roof design on the extended outbuilding. Furthermore, being situated at the bottom of the garden the outbuilding would retain a reasonable separation from the host dwelling when viewed from Glenure Road which runs to the side of the appeal site.
12. In terms of materials, the use of timber cladding on the front elevation of the building, facing into the appeal site's own garden area, would not be prominent in the street. In any case this would not be harmful to the character of the existing outbuilding, the host dwelling or the surrounding area, as timber is a material commonly observed on boundary fences, gates and sheds / outbuildings in residential areas.
13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the outbuilding, the host dwelling, or the surrounding area. The proposal therefore accords with Policy D3 of the London Plan and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, which together seek to ensure that development responds positively to local distinctiveness, is of high-quality design and of a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality.
14. In addition, I find no conflict with the Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversion Guidance, insofar as it seeks to ensure that outbuildings are sensitively designed, proportionate to the original house and garden, and do not impact upon the open character of the surrounding area.

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard time limit condition (1), I have attached a condition specifying the approved plans to provide certainty (2), as well as including a condition which requires the development to be implemented in accordance with the material details shown on the approved plans (3), in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
16. Separately, an interested party has requested that conditions be added to ensure that the outbuilding is not used for business purposes, and that the outbuilding is not used as a separate house. In response to this, the proposal

has been submitted as a Householder Application and therefore planning permission would be required to use the outbuilding for any use other than incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwelling house. As such these suggested conditions are not considered to be either reasonable or necessary to make the proposal acceptable.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would accord with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate it should be determined other than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Major

INSPECTOR