



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2025 by S Jamieson

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3354099

175 Alnwick Road, Eltham SE12 9BX

- 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 Hao Li against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/2658/HD.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension at 175 Alnwick Road, Eltham SE12 9BX, in accordance with the terms of application, Ref 24/2658/HD, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Site Location Plan and ALN175-1.
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

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 proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located in a residential area, predominately comprising two-storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings. The host dwelling is an end-terrace and is situated on a wide cul-de-sac, set back from Alnwick Road. It has a generous garden wrapping around the front, side and rear of the dwelling and is bounded by the substantial corner plot of 177 Alnwick Road (No 177). There are two further terraced blocks and some semi-detached pairs which, together with the appeal site, are positioned around a central, open green. There is much uniformity in the wider street scene in terms of the mainly two-storey scale, more often hipped roof forms and traditional materials. However, alterations and extensions to

neighbouring properties provides a degree of variation, notably in the length of adjacent terraced rows where two-storey side extensions are evident on the cul-de-sac where the appeal dwelling is situated.

5. Given the substantial gap between the host dwelling and No 177, there would be no risk in this instance of creating a continuous building frontage, which is the crux of part (i) of Policy DH(a) with regard to the suitability of two-storey side extensions. Indeed, when considered in the context of the wider terrace, and due to the overall sense of space created by the generous plots and central green, the proposed extension would represent a relatively modest addition to the block and would not cause a substantial change in the appearance of the row when seen from either the cul-de-sac itself or more particularly in the wider street scene where views of the extension would be more side-on. Therefore, I do not share the Council's view that the development would appear as an unduly dominant or bulky addition to the appeal site or surrounding area.
6. The extension would be marginally over half the width of its host, meaning there would be some tension with the guidance in the Council's Urban Design Guide (2023) (the Design Guide). Even so, the proposed extension would accord with some of the other principles for side extensions in the Design Guide, being suitably set back from the front façade and set away from the property boundary. The proposed roof design and use of materials are also consistent with the existing building and local vernacular and would therefore accord with the requirements of Policy DH(a) and the Design Guide in this regard. Overall, due to the site-specific circumstances in this case, varying from some of the Design Guide principles would not result in harm the character and appearance of the area.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it would comply with Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021) and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) which, amongst other things, require developments to respond to the local character and urban context, and to be of a high-quality design.

Conditions

8. A standard implementation condition (1) and a condition (2) listing the approved plans are necessary in the interests of certainty. It is also necessary to include a condition (3) to ensure that the external materials utilised harmonise with the character and appearance of the property.
9. The Council has suggested a condition to restrict the use of the extension for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the house, which is asserted would protect the character of the area and amenity for future occupiers. I have considered this against the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance and given the scale of the proposed development, there are no compelling reasons to suggest the development would be used as a separate dwelling. In any event, planning permission would be required for such. I conclude therefore that it would be neither reasonable nor necessary to impose the condition.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Russell

INSPECTOR