
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2025

by **A Price BSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3349136

485 Sidcup Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 4ET

- 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 Idriz Berisha against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/1693/HD.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of garage and construction of a part one/part two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and extending the patio at the rear with steps to the garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of garage and construction of a part one/part two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and extending the patio at the rear with steps to the garden at 485 Sidcup Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 4ET in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 24/1693/HD, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the Council's description of development as this more concisely describes the proposed scheme. I note the appellant has also used this in their appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached property to the north of Sidcup Road. Properties of a similar scale, design and period exist to the east and west of the site, also along the north side of Sidcup Road. A more varied townscape exists to the south side of Sidcup Road.
5. The appeal property is readily visible from the surrounding public realm by reason of its position at a junction and being set forward of neighbouring No 483. It has undergone alteration and extension previously, in particular through the construction of a roof extension, including hip-to-gable alteration. It is understood that this was conducted under permitted development rights.
6. The proposed development principally relates to the construction of a part single, part two-storey side extension and single-storey rear extension. The two-storey side element would undoubtedly be visible from the public realm. However, it has

been designed to be setback from the front elevation of the main property, with a matching eaves height. The roof ridge level would be set down from the main dwelling. Materials would match the main dwelling. From that perspective, I am satisfied that the extension would appear suitably subservient and proportionate to the main dwelling.

7. Although the main dwelling no longer contains a hipped roof profile, the hipped roof profile of the proposed development would match that original feature of the neighbouring semi-detached property, along with others in the surrounding area. The use of a hipped roof design here, rather than a gable end, would also minimise the overall bulk of the extension and contribute to its subservience, relative to the main dwelling. While I accept the pair of semi-detached properties would appear unbalanced when viewed directly from the front, this would not be harmful in an area where several properties, including the appeal property, have already undergone alterations and extensions over time.
8. I note that the Council accepts that other side extensions of a two storey nature exist within the surrounding area. I observed some of these during my site visit. While these may be historic or, in the Council's view, of poor design, they nevertheless exist and form part of the character of the area. I acknowledge that the proposed development would, to an extent, erode the open space that exists between it and No. 483. However, the alignment of the properties here is not typical of the rest of the street, with the appeal property set well forward of No. 483. As a consequence, the partial infilling of the gap here would not be harmful, and no terracing effect would (or could physically) occur. Mature trees would remain visible over and beyond the extensions.
9. The single-story element of the proposed extension could not reasonably be described as overly bulky or dominant by reason of its overall scale and position, set principally to the rear of the host dwelling. Where seen, views would be limited and fleeting. Ultimately, the proposed development would be appropriate to the building and locality in this instance.
10. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would be acceptable in this location and would accord with the relevant provisions of policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and policy D3 of the London Plan (2021). These policies, in summary, seek to ensure high quality design in development.

Conditions

11. I have imposed conditions on time limits and requiring compliance with the relevant plans in the interests of certainty. A condition requiring the external surfaces of the development to match the existing building is imposed in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, I conclude, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions below.

A Price INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF 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 drawing numbers: Location Plan; SidcupRd485 11 (proposed floor plans); SidcupRd485 12 (existing and proposed front and rear elevations); SidcupRd485 13 (existing and proposed side elevation and cross section); SidcupRd485 14 (existing and proposed block plan and roof plan).
- 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.