



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/24/3357079

7A Halons Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 5BS

- 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 Campbell against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application reference is 24/2979/F.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 7A Halons Road, Eltham, Greenwich, SE9 5BS, in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 24/2979/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 1578-1.00 (OS Location Map), 1578-3.01 (Proposed Ground Floor Plan), 1578-3.02 (Proposed First Floor Plan), 1578-3.03 (Proposed Roof Plan), 1578-3.11 (Proposed Front Elevation), 1578-3.12 (Proposed Side A Elevation), 1578-3.13 (Proposed Section A-A), 1578-3.14 (Proposed Side B Elevation) and 1578-3.15 (Proposed Rear Elevation).
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on drawing nos 1578-3.12 (Proposed Side A Elevation), 1578-3.14 (Proposed Side B Elevation) and 1578-3.15 (Proposed Rear Elevation).

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 host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a ground floor apartment which is part of a two-storey semi-detached building, situated within a predominantly residential area. There is a

general consistency at the first-floor level of the rear elevations along Halons Road, due in part to the reoccurring two-storey outriggers. However, I observed on my site visit that there is a greater variation at ground floor level, as a result of some properties having single storey rear extensions and conservatories. Even if some of these have no planning history, or were permitted development in 1995, or were approved before current policy and guidance, at the current time their presence nevertheless contributes to a more diverse appearance at the ground floor rear elevations on Halons Road.

5. The appeal building as a whole is notable in the street scene for its attractive architectural features, including its decorative bay windows, window and door surrounds and roof ridge. The ground floor apartment itself also has a large bay window on the side elevation of the rear outrigger which further reinforces the attractive appearance of the building as a whole. In that regard, the appeal property contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
6. 'The Royal Borough Greenwich Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document' (2023) (SPD) states that for single storey rear extensions, a 3.6 metre projection from the rear is typically considered appropriate in the area. However, it also states that projections beyond this can be considered for certain typologies where neighbourly amenity is not compromised. It further states that where the rear wall of the original house is stepped, this should be maintained unless the applicant can demonstrate that the impact on neighbouring properties and amenity is negligible.
7. From the submitted evidence, the Council appear to have no concerns regarding the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. I have no reason to disagree with their conclusions on this matter. Furthermore, the evidence indicates that no objections were submitted by any third parties.
8. Despite its depth beyond the limits set out in the SPD, the overall scale of the extension would be modest in comparison to the appeal building as a whole. Even accounting for the wraparound design of the extension, it would be no wider than the appeal property and it would not take away any of its attractive architectural features. The overall design of the extension including its roof form and materials would also be sympathetic to the appearance of the host building. Furthermore, due to its ground floor location to the rear of the property, it would not erode the consistency of the first-floor level and would have a limited impact on the appearance of the street scene and the wider area. Accordingly, even though the extension's depth would not accord with the SPD, the proposal would nevertheless be a high-quality and sympathetic addition to the host building, and it would appear acceptable amongst the varied context of the ground floor rear elevations along Halons Road.
9. In summary, the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. 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). Amongst other matters, these policies require that developments are of a high-quality design which positively contribute to the improvement of the built environment and are limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality. It would also accord with the design principles of the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework which

require that extensions are carefully considered and add to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matter

10. The Council indicate that the appeal proposal has not addressed concerns which were raised within previous applications. Whether or not this is the case, I have assessed the proposal on its own individual merits and have found that it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Conditions

11. 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 the reason of certainty.
12. The Council have suggested a matching materials condition. However, the main external elevations of the appeal property appear to be pebble dash rendered, whereas the proposal will use London stock brickwork. Moreover, in the Officer Report the Council indicate that the materials are acceptable and they have no issues with them. I have therefore included a condition requiring that the development is constructed in the materials shown on the plans. I am satisfied that there are sufficient details on the plans to ensure that the proposal does not harm the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposed development would comply with the development plan as a whole and there are no identified other matters, including the provisions of the SPD and the Framework, which would alter this finding. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR