

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 March 2017

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 17 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/16/3167716

60 Ridgebrook Road, London SE3 9QN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ekrem Cena against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 16/1642/F was refused by notice dated 29 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a 1st floor side extension with a loft conversion/rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 1st floor side extension with a loft conversion/rear dormer in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/1642/F, dated 9 November 2015, 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 the following approved plans: 03, 06 and 07.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the house and the local area.

Reasons

3. 60 Ridgebrook Road is a small, hipped roof semi-detached house sitting on a corner plot within a residential neighbourhood of mainly semi-detached and terraced houses and maisonettes. A flat roofed single storey extension has been built to the side, infilling most of the area between the house and the side boundary with Tilbrook Road. The proposal would add a hipped roof first floor section on top of that existing side extension, plus a loft conversion including a new box dormer window structure at the back.
-

4. Due to its corner location and the slope of the land, the extension would sit above Ridgebrook Road as a prominent feature in the street scene. It would also be prominent in views from Tilbrook Road, in part because it would sit well forward of the main building line there.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) *Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance* advises that side extensions should normally be set back slightly from the front wall of the house and that the width of side extensions should normally be less than half the width of the main house. It stresses that on corner plots in particular, side extensions should be proportionate to the dimensions of the main house and should sit at least a metre back from the side boundary.
6. In this case, the first floor extension would not be set back and would be well over half of the width of the main house. Although it would thus create long, unarticulated front and back walls this would not be markedly out of character in an area that also contains terraced housing of similar design and scale. The extension would not be excessively or disproportionately wide and would sit more than a metre away from the boundary. With matching materials and detailing, it would fit well in the local context.
7. The proposed dormer structure would sit well within the extended roof, whose hip would maintain the general architectural form of the building. In contrast, the hip to gable and box dormer conversion I saw on a nearby house would have been a much less sympathetic solution here.
8. Although this is a prominent building and the proposal would conflict with some of the detailed guidance in the SPD, I conclude that the extension would not harm the character or the appearance of the house or the local area. The proposal therefore accords with the aims of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies and the SPD, to secure high quality designs that contribute to the improvement of the built environment, limiting extensions to a scale and design appropriate to the building and the locality. These aims align with the National Planning Policy Framework's emphasis on quality design that reinforces local distinctiveness.
9. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is also necessary, as already stated.
10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR