



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2026 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/25/3375446

9 Brownspring Drive, New Eltham, London SE9 3JY

- 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 D Granger against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 25/1487/HD.
 - The development proposed is alterations to front elevation, garage conversion and rear/side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to front elevation, garage conversion and rear/side extension at 9 Brownspring Drive, New Eltham, London SE9 3JY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/1487/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 drawing Nos 659/24/01A, 659/24/05/A, 659/24/04/A, 659/24/03/A and 659/24/02/A; and
 - 3) The external materials of the extension 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 proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of 7 Brownspring Drive, with particular regard to outlook and daylight/sunlight.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey semi-detached property within a residential street that has previously been extended at ground floor level to the rear. Its attached neighbour is No 7 which creates a sensitive relationship due to the proximity of the dwellings. There is a close boarded timber fence forming the shared boundary between the neighbouring properties.

5. Whilst the proposal would result in a modest increase in depth of built form against the shared boundary, it would be lower in height than the existing extension because of the uniform flat roof. As a consequence, the appeal scheme would not materially alter the existing relationship with regard to outlook and daylight/sunlight and there is no substantive evidence to indicate otherwise. The living conditions of the neighbouring occupants would not therefore be diminished as a result of the proposal which would accord with the guidance set out in the Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2023) that residential extensions should not harm amenity.
6. To conclude, the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No 7, with particular regard to outlook and daylight/sunlight. As such, the proposal would comply with Policy DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) insofar as it requires development to avoid the unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers through a reduction in daylight, sunlight or resulting in an unneighbourly sense of enclosure.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the proposal be carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. To protect the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary to impose a condition to secure the use of matching materials.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

F Harrison

INSPECTOR