



---

# 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/23/3327927**

### **5 Haimo Road, Eltham, London, 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 Council of The Royal Borough of Greenwich.
  - The application ref 23/1917/HD, dated 12 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2023.
  - The development proposed is a first floor part side and part rear extension.
- 

### **Preliminary matters**

1. At the time of my site visit it was apparent work was underway at the property, but not complete. I have determined this appeal on the basis of seeking permission for the development as proposed and described in the application refused by the Council.

### **Decision**

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor part side and part rear extension at 5 Haimo Road, Eltham, London, SE9 6DZ in accordance with the terms of the application ref 23/1917/HD, dated 12 June 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) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
  - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: site location plan, 2004 Rev A, 2005 Rev A, 2005, Rev A, 2006, 2007, 2008.

### **Reasons**

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area.
  4. The property is a semi-detached house that lies on the southern side of Hamio Road, where there are terraces of houses to either side. Opposite the site are the buildings and grounds of a primary school. No. 5 and its neighbour have been extended and altered in the past and, most notably for No. 5, permission was granted on appeal in 2023 for a first floor side extension, with that extension under construction (ref. APP/E5330/D/23/3316606).
-

5. The extension proposed in the current appeal would project rearwards from that approved extension. This would result in little change in the appearance of the property when seen from Hamio Road: the width of the plot is largely filled by the 2023 extension, which has led to the overall scale and appearance of the house more closely reflecting the longer terraces of housing that adjoin. The additional depth to the property would have an imperceptible impression on the visual presence that the building plays to the street. Although in floorspace terms the cumulative increase of extensions would be greater than the original house, the positioning, scale and design of the extensions would not visually dominate or overwhelm the property.
6. I saw at my site visit that the pair of houses of Nos. 5 & 6 are set back into their plots slightly further than the adjoining terraces with deeper rear building lines at first floor and ground floor and, as noted earlier, these houses are of different design and scale. There are also extensions and outbuildings to the rear of these and other properties. In this context of mixed character, the proposed first floor rear extension – projecting beyond the rear elevation – would not be detrimental to the character of the wider area. The design of the extension shows a pitched roof to match the host property, with a notably lower ridge line, and so the appearance of the house would similarly not be harmed.
7. The Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversion Guidance 2018 (SPD) resists rear extensions that would impact on neighbouring properties and the street scene. In this instance I consider the proposed development would not be imposing upon such matters, and the extended house would be an acceptable further change to the house and so comply with the SPD. On the main issue it is therefore concluded that the proposals would not harm the character and appearance of the area, and hence not conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), which seek to ensure residential extensions are of a scale and design appropriate to the area.
8. From my observations at the site visit I am satisfied that the extension would be sufficient distance from the boundaries of the site to ensure no overbearing effect on neighboring occupiers, and no material effect on levels of light. The design of the extension would ensure no loss of privacy to occupiers. Thus, the proposals would accord with the provision of the SPD and the development plan policies referred to above, which protect the amenity of existing occupiers.
9. The appeal is therefore allowed. I have attached the Council's suggested conditions requiring matching materials, to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, and a condition specifying the approved plans both in the interest of precision.

*C J Leigh*

INSPECTOR