



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2024 by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3353904

36 The Knole, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 3DR

- 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 Alexei Rusu against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application ref is 24/2804/HD.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of single storey side extension and replacing of garage space with outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single storey side extension and replacing of garage space with outbuilding at 36 The Knole, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 3DR in accordance with the terms of the application, ref. 24/2804/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 following approved plans: Location Plan; Proposed Block Plan; 201; and 202.

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 appeal property forms a two-storey, end terrace dwelling on a corner plot. The area is primarily characterised by groups of largely homogenous terraces set back from the highway giving the street scene an attractive wide and open character. Development between these dwellings and the highway is predominantly single storey and usually features a flat roof which reduces the visual presence of the built form and preserves the character of the main property and the openness of the area.

5. The front and side elevation of the appeal property are set back from the highway. A tall fence demarks the site boundary adjacent to the side elevation, with a single storey garage adjoining this boundary. The fence and garage are visually subservient to the much larger appeal dwelling and as such do not impact the appeal site's contribution to the aforementioned openness of the street scene.
6. The proposal would involve the erection of a single storey side extension. The materials proposed would match that of the existing dwelling, with the hipped roof at the front further facilitating its assimilation with the built environment. The front elevation of the proposal would continue the building line of the existing dwelling, with the central flat section of the roof and single storey form creating a subservience to the host property. The proposed side extension would be close to the boundary with the highway, but its single-storey form and low profile would limit its projection above the boundary fence. The proposal would therefore appear inconspicuous when viewed from the highway, preserving the visual set back of the appeal property and the resultant contribution to the openness of the public realm. Furthermore, the use of a flat roof would be consistent with other development within the area such as the existing garage at the appeal site, reflecting the character of the built form.
7. The Royal Borough of Greenwich Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2023) (SPD) requires side extensions to reflect the roof pitch of the original house. Further, Policy DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) (CS) states that flat roofs on side extensions will not be accepted in order to preserve the existing character of the host dwelling and street scene. The SPD goes on to require side extensions to be set back at least 0.5 metres from the front façade of the existing building and maintain a 1.2 metre gap with the side boundary so as to remain subservient and preserve openness. Given its form, the proposal would be subservient to and reflect the character of the appeal property, as well as maintaining the openness of the street scene. The prevailing character and appearance of the area would therefore be maintained. There are thus material considerations that justify the departure from this element of the above Policy and guidance in this case.
8. The proposal would additionally involve the replacement of the existing garage with a slightly larger outbuilding in a similar location. The Council raises no objection to this element of the proposal and based on the evidence before me and what I observed at my site visit, I concur with the Council on this matter.
9. Accordingly, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the area and therefore accord with the relevant provisions of Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the CS, which when read together require development to be appropriate to the building and locality, and positively respond to local distinctiveness.

Conditions

10. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. Specifications of external materials are included within the submitted plans and therefore a separate materials condition is not required.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would accord with the development plan when read as a whole and there is nothing sufficiently compelling to lead me to find otherwise. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

N Unwin

APPEAL 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.

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR