



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2024 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MRTPI
MIEMA CEnv

Decision by Chris Forreth BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3331373

49 Felhampton Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 3NT

- 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 Ms Geraldine Julius against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 23/2464/HD, dated 24 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey part front part side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for erection of a single-storey part front part side extension at 49 Felhampton Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 3NT in accordance with the terms of application Ref 23/2464/HD, dated 24 July 2023 and 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: Site Location Plan; Plans 160-SE9-GA-ZZ-XX-DR-N/A-20021 Revision-01, 160-SE9-GA-ZZ-00-DR-N/A-200301 Revision-01, 160-SE9-GA-ZZ-00-DR-N/A-200302 Revision-01, 160-SE9-GA-ZZ-02-DR-N/A-200303 Revision-01, 160-SE9-GA-ZZ-XX-DR-N/A-200401 Revision-01, 160-SE9-GA-ZZ-XX-DR-N/A-200402 Revision-01, 160-SE9-GA-ZZ-XX-DR-N/A-200403 Revision-01, 160-SE9-GA-ZZ-XX-DR-N/A-200501 Revision-01, 160-SE9-GA-ZZ-XX-DR-N/A-200502 Revision-01.
 - 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.

Procedural Matters

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.
3. At my site visit, I observed that building works were already being undertaken. However, these were not reflective of the plans before me. I note that the

Council have referred to an already approved proposal for demolition of existing garage and construction of a single-storey side extension and associated works¹. However, as these plans are not before me, I cannot confirm that is the work being carried out. Notwithstanding that, I will proceed to determine the appeal based on the plans before me.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on Felhampton Road in the Eltham area of Greenwich, London. The surrounding area is residential and is predominantly characterised by two-storey semi-detached dwellings of similar design on both sides of the street. Properties generally have either front porches or canopies and garages to the side or towards the rear. This presents some semblance of a neat, unified street scene, even though some of the porches vary in the type of materials used.
6. Many of the properties on the street have been extended in a variety of form, design and scale which was evident from my site visit. I note that the Council acknowledges this, and the existence of several examples of precedence with properties within the surrounding area having extended their properties in a similar way to that proposed in this appeal. They however contend that these examples were either constructed without formal planning consent or were approved prior to the adoption of the current development plan.
7. Be that as it may, these have been in situ over an extended period and as such can be considered to be established features which form part of the character of the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposal would not appear as an alien addition to the character of the area. Significantly, in my view, the resultant development would not appear dominant especially considering the existence of other developments in the area. Similarly, it would not appear incongruous in the context of the surrounding area.
8. In coming to the above view, I acknowledge that this does not exactly conform to the expectations of the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). However, this is a guidance document and paragraph 5.28 sets out that extensions should *normally* (my emphasis) be set back slightly from the front wall of the house to allow the original house to remain prominent. In this case, and in the context of the existing streetscene, it is not necessary to ensure that the side extension part of the proposal is set back from the main front elevation of the host property. As such, the fact that the proposal does not accord with the expectations of the SPD is not, in my mind, a barrier to the granting of planning permission.
9. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would accord 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) which collectively seek to ensure that development proposals enhance local context by delivering buildings and

¹ Reference 23/1805/HD

spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Conditions

10. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have also included a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building, to protect the character and appearance of the area. These are also reflective of conditions suggested by the Council.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence, and my representative's report, and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR