



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2023

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3326179

66 Appleton Road, Eltham, London, SE9 6NR

- 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 Nelu Nistor against the decision of the Council of The Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application 23/1139/HD, dated 31 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and rear wrap-around extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side and rear wrap-around extension at 66 Appleton Road, Eltham, London, SE9 6NR in accordance with the terms of the application ref 23/1139/HD, dated 31 March 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No development shall take place above ground floor slab level until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Block plan, 15.243.000, 15.243.001, 15.243.002, 15.243.003, 15.243.004, 15.243.009, 15.243.010, 15.243.0011, 15.243.012, 15.243.013.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area.
 3. The property is one half of a pair of semi-detached houses, set higher than land to the south. It lies on a large plot of irregular proportions and there is a good degree of spaciousness around the house, which derives from the distance between the property and the pair of semi-detached houses to the south, and open land to the north and east. The wider residential area sees housing of relatively low density, set back from the road.
 4. The proposals would see a two storey extension to the side and rear of the property. The Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document:
-

Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversion Guidance 2018 (SPD) recognises such extensions can provide additional space for houses and sets out guidance.

5. I consider the proposals satisfy the objectives of the SPD. The side extension would have a roof pitch to match the existing house, the ridge line would be lowered and the front wall set back slightly from the front elevation. A good distance would be retained to the southern boundary, and the width of the extension would not be greater than half that of the main house. The rear extension would also be set away from the boundaries and not dominate the house, with the proportions of roof and extension reflecting the existing building. These matters combine to ensure the extensions – when seen together as a combined addition – are proportionate to the building and appear appropriate to the appearance of the house.
6. For similar reasons as set out above, the scale of the side and rear extensions would be suitable for the wider character of the area. The extensions would be visible in the wider area, due to views across the open areas that adjoin and the elevated position of the house, but a good degree of spaciousness would remain around the property; the character of the area would not be harmed. Although the pair of semi-detached houses would be imbalanced as a result of the extensions, as the design and scale of the extensions are appropriate for the house and in relation to neighbouring properties, this imbalance is not a feature that would be unduly intrusive into the wider area.
7. On the main issue it is therefore concluded that the proposals would be appropriate for the host property and the area. Thus there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the area, and hence no conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and the SPD, whose general aim is to seek to ensure residential extensions are of a scale and design appropriate to the area.
8. The distance retained from the proposed extensions to boundaries, and the scale and depth of the proposals, ensure that there would not be any appreciable impact upon the outlook from neighboring properties or levels of light. Windows are proposed in elevations where there are currently windows, and so there would not be any material change in overlooking.
9. The proposed development is therefore consistent with the development plan and the appeal is allowed. The Council have suggested a number of conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. One of these is to seek matching materials, but the Delegated Report refers to the preference for different materials, and the appellant's submissions agree with this request. I have therefore modified the condition relating to materials to allow for future agreement regarding the desired choice of materials and, since both parties show agreement to the need for such a condition, I consider it is reasonable to modify the condition in this fashion. I have attached the suggested condition specifying the approved plans both in the interest of precision.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR