



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025

by H Whitfield BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/25/3360205

5 and 7 Dunvegan Road, London SE9 1RZ

- 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 Mrs Kristina Lokman against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/3845/F.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey rear extension to two (2) immediately adjacent properties. Installation of new external landscaping including rear raised platforms with external balustrading and associated external works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single storey rear extension to two (2) immediately adjacent properties. Installation of new external landscaping including rear raised platforms with external balustrading and associated external works at 5 and 7 Dunvegan Road, London SE9 1RZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/3845/F, 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 drawing nos: SE9-PLN-0001 Rev. P01 'Existing Site Plan', SE9-PLN-0011 Rev. P01 'Proposed Site Plan', SE-PLN-0012 Rev. P01 'Proposed Plans', SE9-PLN-0013 Rev. P01 'Proposed Elevations' and SE0-PLN-0014 Rev. P01 'Proposed Section'.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan nos: SE9-PLN-0013 Rev. P01 'Proposed Elevations' and SE0-PLN-0014 Rev. P01 'Proposed Section'.

Preliminary Matters

2. The address used on the application form included only the house numbers, street name and postcode. Therefore, for the avoidance of doubt, I have added reference to the site's location in London in the banner heading and my formal decision, which matches what the appellant has used on the appeal form.
3. During my site visit I observed that works were taking place to the rear of 7 Dunvegan Road which appeared to relate to the construction of a single storey rear extension. No details of these alterations have been supplied to me in evidence. Nevertheless, and for the avoidance of doubt, I have considered this appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site relates to 5 and 7 Dunvegan Road (No 5 and No 7) which are a pair of two-storey semi-detached dwellings with long rear gardens which decrease in gradient towards the rear boundaries. The site is within a predominately residential area characterised mainly by two-storey semi-detached and terraced properties of a similar style and appearance. On the appeal site side of the road, properties in the vicinity are relatively evenly spaced with small gaps between properties providing pedestrian access to rear gardens. The limited separation gaps between properties restricts achievable views to the rear from the public realm.
6. Properties on Dunvegan Road back onto Greenvale Road and from the rear gardens of the sites I observed that properties on both roads have undertaken extensions and roof alterations to the rear. Consequently, whilst there is general uniformity to the front of the site, from the rear the area has a more varied character and appearance. There are also several commercial units located along Well Hall Road and Well Hall Parade to the west. From my observations, many of these premises have long single storey flat roofed or mono-pitched rear outriggers which project towards the appeal site.
7. The appeal scheme proposes the construction of a single storey rear extension to both No 5 and No 7, raised platforms and external balustrading. The extensions would span the full width of both properties, constructed in matching brickwork and would have a partially flat, partially sloped green roof tapering towards the rear garden.
8. The Council has raised no concerns with the proposed roof form, height and green roof, which aligns with the guidance contained at paragraph i.91 of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2023) (the SPD). Nor have they identified any concerns with the construction of the raised patio area and balustrades, which they consider to be acceptable in design terms. I see no reason to come to a different conclusion on these matters. The crux of the Council's case therefore relates to the depth of the proposed extensions.
9. The extensions would be approximately 6m deep and would be deeper than half the depth of the original dwellings. However, their single storey form, modest height and tapered roof design would ensure that the extensions would not appear as dominating or unbalancing additions to the dwellings. The tapered design of the roof would also particularly assist in reducing the bulk of the extensions, which in any event, would not be highly prominent or visible within the street scene. The use of matching materials, inclusion of the green roofs and overall proportions of the extensions would result in harmonious additions to the appeal buildings, such that any achievable views from surrounding properties would be of a development that would integrate well within the site contexts.
10. Whilst the depth would be greater than the typical depth of 3.6m as advised by principle I.3.3 of the SPD, this design guidance does not seek to exclusively resist larger developments and acknowledges that projections beyond this can be acceptable where living conditions are not compromised. In this case, the Council has not identified any concerns in respect of living conditions and the developments would be subservient to the overall scale of the dwellings. Moreover, irrespective of whether

similar examples of extensions in the vicinity have been constructed under permitted development or not, larger flat roof developments are not uncommon in the area and can be seen on both residential and commercial buildings in the vicinity. Therefore, the developments would not be uncharacteristic or alien in this context.

11. For the above reasons, I therefore find the proposed extensions would not harm the character or appearance of the appeal buildings or the surrounding area. Accordingly, the appeal scheme 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, together and amongst other things, seek high quality developments that respond appropriately to a sites context and character and improves the built environment.

Conditions

12. I have considered the planning conditions suggested by the Council against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed conditions specifying the period for commencement and requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interest of planning certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the use of materials as specified on the approved plans to ensure that the development has an appropriate visual appearance and maintains the character and appearance of the buildings and area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development accords with the development plan and the appeal should be allowed.

H Whitfield

INSPECTOR