



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2019

by S A Whitehead LLB (Hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3228255

23 Glenhouse Road, London SE9 1JH

- 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 W Trinh against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/0809/HD, dated 11 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a hip-to-gable roof extension, rear dormer roof extension and installation of 4 rooflights to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a hip-to-gable roof extension, rear dormer roof extension and installation of 4 rooflights to front roof slope at 23 Glenhouse Road, London SE9 1JH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/0809/HD, dated 11 February 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No. 07 LC Proposed Elevations Loft Conversion, Drawing No. 06 LC Proposed Second Floor Plan Loft Conversion, Drawing No. 05 LC Proposed 1st Floor Plan Loft Conversion, Ordnance Survey Location Map
 - 3) The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council altered the description of the development from 'Hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer and rooflights to front elevation. Removal of rear chimney and extend height of front chimney' to 'Construction of a hip-to-gable roof extension, rear dormer roof extension and installation of 4 rooflights to front roof slope.' This is also the description used by the appellant on the appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposal and I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.
3. I have used the address provided on the application form although I note that it is expressed differently on the appeal form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property comprises a substantial two storey end of terrace dwelling with a hipped roof, situated on a residential street of similar terraced and semi-detached dwellings that appear to date from the late 19th or early 20th century. The majority of properties have hipped roofs, the small number of gabled roofs evident appearing to be the result of subsequent alterations. The properties are evenly spaced, with a gap of a few metres between each terrace of four dwellings or pair of semi-detached dwellings.
6. The proposed roof enlargement would not reduce the distance between the side wall of the appeal property and its neighbour, No. 25, another end-terrace property, and the existing, albeit narrow, gap between the two properties would be preserved. The extension would not thus result in a terracing effect or close the gap between the properties. Aside from this, I do not find that the additional bulk resulting from the construction of the gable end would result in the appeal property appearing cramped, or otherwise harmfully affect its relationship to No. 25.
7. Whilst the substitution of the existing hipped roof for a gabled roof would alter the form and appearance of the dwelling and thus, to an extent, its contribution to the wider street scene, I do not find that the scale of the extension would be disproportionate, or that it would render the dwelling 'top heavy.' The appeal property is a substantial, double-fronted dwelling and the hip to gable extension would not be out of scale with the proportions of the existing building.
8. Although the vast majority of properties in Glenhouse Road have hipped roofs, a small number have gabled roofs, and I do not consider that the provision of a conventional gable end to the roof of the appeal property would appear incongruous. I am also mindful that the relatively narrow gap between the properties and the uniform set back of the dwellings from the road would reduce the prominence of the gable end in views gained from Glenhouse Road.
9. I note that the Council's reason for refusal also includes reference to the box dormer. However, from my own observation, the box dormer would not be readily apparent in views from Glenhouse Road, being screened by the gable end. I find that the box dormer would not, thus, have an effect upon the Glenhouse Road street scene; which, from the reason for refusal, I understand to be the Council's overriding concern.
10. Therefore, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the street scene of Glenhouse Road. As such it would accord with policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014. These policies require all new development to achieve high quality design, to positively contribute to the improvement of the built environment taking account of the architecture, scale, height, bulk and massing of the adjacent townscape, avoid a 'terracing effect' and be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality. It would also comply

with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2016 which have similar aims in relation to local character generally.

11. I appreciate that the proposal would be contrary to the guidance contained in the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (SPD) insofar as it seeks to resist roof alterations involving the conversion of sloped hip end into a flat roof gable on the side of a house. However, such a breach of the Council's guidance would not in itself make the proposal unacceptable having regard to the circumstances of this case. I have found that the hip to gable conversion would not give the house a top heavy look, would be proportionate to the size of the house and would preserve the dwelling's existing appearance in terms of height, scale and visual interest as otherwise set out in this SPD.

Conclusion

12. Having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted subject to conditions that are necessary in the interests of certainty.

Sandra Whitehead

INSPECTOR