



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2024 by M Long BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3341029

127 Paston Crescent, Eltham, Greenwich SE12 9DZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Nanthi Para against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 23/3959/HD.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension at 127 Paston Crescent, Eltham, Greenwich SE12 9DZ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/3959/HD, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: MKM/23/PAS127/PL03 (Page 01/04), MKM/23/PAS127/PL03 (Page 02/04), MKM/23/PAS127/PL03 (Page 03/04) and MKM/23/PAS127/PL03 (Page 04/04).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the external surfaces of the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The Paston Crescent streetscene is characterised by short terraces and semi-detached pairs that have a variety of traditional design styles, layouts and orientations. Generally, there are gaps between the groups of houses and while these gaps vary in width, they provide for a pleasant spaciousness which positively contributes to the residential character of the area.

5. 127 Paston Crescent is an end-of-terrace dwelling with a side garage close to the shared boundary with 113 Paston Crescent. No 113 is set well away from the boundary and has a splayed orientation to the appeal dwelling which further pronounces the gap between these neighbouring dwellings. As a result, there is generous visual spacing between the two properties.
6. The side extension would be sited close to the boundary. Nevertheless, the space within the neighbouring plot between the boundary and the angled side elevation of No 113 would retain a suitable degree of spaciousness between the dwellings. Furthermore, as the extension would be set back in relation to the existing front gabled projection and would incorporate a lowered ridgeline, this would ensure that the proposal would not be unduly dominant. These factors would also ensure that the proposal would accord with the guidance in the Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2022) for two-storey side extensions to avoid terracing effects and loss of open character between properties. Furthermore, I agree with the Council's delegated report that the rear extension is of an appropriate design.
7. I conclude that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) specifically Policy DH(a) (Residential Extensions) which limits proposals for side additions to a scale and design appropriate to the locality and Policy DH1 (Design) which expects all development to take account of established layout and spatial character. It would accord with Policy D3 (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach) of The London Plan (2021) which seeks proposals that respond to the existing character of a place. There would be no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically Paragraph 135 which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and Paragraph 139 which seeks to resist development that is not well designed.

Other Matters

8. I have considered the appeal on the basis of the extensions applied for. Whether the extended appeal property could potentially become a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) in the future is a matter that is outside the scope of this appeal.
9. Concerns have been raised regarding the upkeep of a boundary treatment at the appeal site. This matter is not pertinent to the proposed scheme, which must form the basis of this appeal recommendation.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time period for commencement, I recommend a condition to require that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, which is necessary in the interests of certainty.
11. I also recommend that matching external materials are used to ensure that the development positively relates to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider street scene.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposed development would accord with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Russell

INSPECTOR