
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2025

by A Wright BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/24/3357546

455 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 Yuntao Yi of Y.P. Fortune Limited against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/3306/F.
 - The development proposed is the change of use from C3 to C4, partial single garage conversion and double storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The garage has already been converted and the rear extension has been built but the building does not appear to be occupied. There are some different door and window types but otherwise the works appear consistent with the proposed plans. I have determined the appeal based on the submitted plans considered by the Council.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey dwelling in a residential area where semi-detached properties are prevalent. Many houses in the locality have single storey side and rear additions but at my site visit I did not observe any two storey rear extensions nearby. The host dwelling and other properties in proximity have matching original triple sided two storey rear projections and most have hipped, tiled roofs which give uniformity to the upper levels of the buildings to the rear.
5. The proposed scheme is for a two storey flat roof rear extension and the partial conversion of the garage. There is no dispute that the proposed garage alterations are acceptable.
6. The Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2023 requires the scale, bulk and massing of any double storey extension to be carefully considered so that it does not overwhelm the existing building. This can be achieved by maintaining appropriate distances between the extension roof and the

eaves of the existing building and reducing the width of the extension to one third or half the plot width, amongst other things.

7. The proposed rear addition has a flat roof up to the level of the existing eaves and is more than half the width of the original dwelling, wider than the existing rear projection. The substantial width of the extension together with its two storey height mean that it obscures part of the original triple sided projection, detracting from the symmetry of the rear streetscape.
8. Further, due to its flat roof profile and significant height, the extension appears as a jarring and discordant addition which fails to integrate with the hipped roof form of the appeal dwelling and other houses in the locality. Although located to the rear of the building, the top part of the extension is visible from Sidcup Road and appears incongruous in views from it.
9. The appellant is willing to accept a condition on the external finish of the extension, but this would not overcome the harm caused by its design, scale and form.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal harms the character and appearance of the area. This is contrary to 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. Amongst other things, these require developments to be of a high quality design and take account of spatial character, with extensions to be of a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality.

Other Matters

11. Permitted development (PD) rights¹ allow for a two storey extension to a dwellinghouse where, so far as practicable, it has the same roof pitch as the original dwellinghouse. However, the proposed extension has a flat rather than a hipped roof and it has not been demonstrated that it could not have the same roof pitch as the original house. In any event, it is proposed to change the use of the dwelling to a house in multiple occupation (HMO) and an extension could not be installed under PD rights for a building converted to an HMO.
12. The proposal complies with the Council's standards for HMOs, but the Council did not find harm or development plan conflict in relation to the proposed use of the property as an HMO. I have no reason to disagree.
13. The appellant has expressed general dissatisfaction with the Council's handling of the application, but this is a matter between those parties and does not in this instance have any bearing on my determination of this appeal.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Wright

INSPECTOR

¹ Under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015