



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2025

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3352039

1 Bowmead, Eltham, London SE9 3NL

- 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 Yan Li against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
- The application reference is 24/2021/HD.
- The development proposed is a single-storey ground-floor rear extension and part first-floor rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey ground-floor rear extension and part first-floor rear extension at 1 Bowmead, Eltham, London SE9 3NL in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 24/2021/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 drawings:
 - Block Plan (Drawing D12, 11 June 2024)
 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan (Drawing D03, 11 June 2024)
 - Proposed First Floor Plan (Drawing D04, 11 June 2024)
 - Proposed Roof Plan (Drawing D06, 11 June 2024)
 - Proposed Elevations (Drawing D09, 11 June 2024)
 - Proposed Elevations (Drawing D10, 11 June 2024)
 - Proposed Section A-A (Drawing D11, 11 June 2024)
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No 1 Bowmead is a two-storey detached dwelling, with a single-storey set-back side extension linking the main part of the dwelling to an attached side garage (though the submitted drawings and my observations during my site visit indicate that at least part of the “garage” has now been adapted to provide additional living accommodation). The house has front and rear gardens. It is within a suburban residential area mostly comprising typical mid-20th century semi-detached housing,

though the appeal property is part of a more recently developed area of semi-detached and detached dwellings dating from, I would estimate, the late 20th century or very early 21st century.

4. The proposed development is the construction of a single-storey ground-floor rear extension, with a part first-floor extension. At present the existing side extension and (former) garage give the house an approximately L-shaped footprint; the flat-roofed ground-floor extension would project approximately 4m beyond the back of the main dwelling and would be approximately 7.8m wide. It would span the full width of the main rear elevation, infilling part of the space within the "L". The first-floor extension would be around 2m deep and 2.7m wide, approximately centred on the main rear elevation; it would have a hipped roof.
5. The Council's 2023 *Urban Design Guide* Supplementary Planning Document ("the SPD") provides various guidance including in respect of rear extensions. Among other things, it advises that for single-storey rear extensions "a 3.6m projection from the rear is typically considered appropriate", though it goes on to say that "projections beyond this can be considered [...] where neighbourly amenity is not compromised". It is notable that the extension would be in the space between the existing rear extension of the appeal property and the flat-roofed rear extension at No 3 Bowmead, the neighbouring dwelling to the south-east. Though the proposed extension would perhaps be somewhat deeper than that at No 3, because of the different rear building line it would still be set behind the neighbouring extension; there is no suggestion that the amenity of neighbouring properties would be compromised in this case. I find that no harm would arise from any failure to comply with this element of the advice in the SPD.
6. The first-floor part of the extension would be relatively modest in scale, and its roof would be set down from the dwelling's main roof ridge, so it would be subservient and secondary in appearance; I note that the Council did not express concern about that element of the scheme considered in isolation. It is not clear from the evidence before me whether or not the garage and side extension of No 1 Bowmead are original or later additions, as the Council's officer report does not identify any relevant planning history for the property. Although the Council expressed concern about the cumulative impact of extensions, the property would retain a rear garden of an adequate and acceptable size, and there is nothing before me to indicate that the development would not comply with the SPD advice that "no less than 50% of the original rear amenity space should be retained by any new extension, cumulatively with existing extensions".
7. The proposed extension would be in a discreet location at the rear of the property so would not be visible in the street scene. It would be sufficiently separate from neighbouring dwellings that it would not be visually intrusive, dominant or overbearing. Materials would match those of the existing main dwelling.
8. Taking all of these points together, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the area. It would therefore be in accordance with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the 2014 Royal Greenwich Local Plan and Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 which, among other things, seek to ensure that development takes account of the existing townscape and its established layout and spatial character, and that residential extensions are of a scale and design appropriate to the host building and locality.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have specified the approved plans so as to provide certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area I have included a condition requiring materials matching the existing dwelling to be used for the extension.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

M Cryan

Inspector