



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2024

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3330906

4 Broad Lawn, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 3XD

- 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 Spencer Fosberry against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 23/0231/HD, dated 23 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear & rear/side extension with loft conversion and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear & rear/side extension with loft conversion and internal alterations at 4 Broad Lawn, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 3XD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/0231/HD, dated 23 January 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: BROAD-LAWN/PP/YBS/01-22/D1, BROAD-LAWN/PP/YBS/01-22/D2 and BROAD-LAWN/PP/YBS/01-22/D3.
 - 3) 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.

Preliminary Matter

2. Revised versions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for the appeal. I have had regard to the latest version of the Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons

4. There is relative consistency to the rear building lines along this row of properties albeit there is some variation. Unlike the semi-detached properties to the west, the appeal property is detached. At present the property is set back from the first floor rear building line of those properties to its west. The proposal would extend the first floor to the same depth as the existing single storey extension at the property. This first floor addition would project beyond the rear building line of No.6 to the west but not by much. I do not consider the projection of the first storey at the rear would be so substantially out of keeping with the rear building line that would cause significant harm to the characteristics of the street.
5. The property is of individual design to the rear. I do not consider the projection of the extension would appear substantially at odds with the context of neighbouring properties. The proposal, although extending the full width of the rear of the dwelling, would be subservient in that it would be lower than the ridge height of the host property. Whilst the proposal would create built form, the original dwelling would still be clearly discernible. As such, I do not consider the proposal would be so large as to dominate the original dwelling or have such an overbearing visual impact that would significantly harm the appearance of the host property. Furthermore, given the host dwelling's close proximity to the properties either side, the visual impact of the proposal at the rear of the dwelling would not be clearly visible in public views from the street scene.
6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. As such, the proposed development would comply with Policy D3 of the London Plan, Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies and the Council's Residential Extensions, Basement and Conversions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). These policies and SPD seek, amongst other matters, development to be of high quality design and to have as little impact as possible on the character of the house, neighbouring properties and the street scene.

Conditions

7. I have considered the planning conditions put forward by the Council in light of paragraph 56 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition and in the interests of certainty it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the visual interests of the locality a condition requiring matching materials of the extension is necessary.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, and subject to the conditions listed, this appeal should be allowed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR