



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2019

by John Dowsett MA DipURP DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/19/3231828

76 Herbert Road, Woolwich, London SE18 3PP

- 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 G Bryce of Texcel Developments Limited against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/0733/F, dated 28 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a mansard roof extension to form one flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a mansard roof extension to form one flat at 76 Herbert Road, Woolwich, London SE18 3PP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 19/0733/F, dated 28 January 2019, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a two storey end of terrace property with a semi-basement and an attic within the pitched roof with a dormer window. It has previously been extended to the side with a three storey addition located on the corner of Herbert Road and Eglinton Road. This later addition projects forward of the building line of the original terrace and has a different pattern of windows and detailing to the rest of the terrace. The ground floor of the side addition has previously been used as a day nursery and the Council advise that planning permission was granted in 2018 to allow the ground floor to be used for any purpose falling within use Class D1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended); excluding a place of worship, church halls and centres, and for the conversion of the upper floors of the extension to flats.
4. The side addition currently has a hipped roof with two different ridge heights, one which matches the terraced house to which it is attached, and the second, lower, ridge running parallel to Eglinton Road. It is proposed to replace this roof with a new roof structure that would have sloping roof planes facing Herbert Road and Eglinton Road. This roof would match and continue the ridge

- height of the pitched roof of the original terraced house. Three small dormer windows would be included on the front roof planes. The remainder of the proposed roof extension would have a flat roof and brick walls rising vertically from the main walls of the building below to the level of the flat roof.
5. The surrounding area consists of buildings of a range of ages, heights and architectural styles with no prevailing style or height. To the north east of its junction with Eglinton Road and Eglinton Hill, Herbert Road has a more commercial character and to the south west is predominantly residential. The surrounding streets are primarily residential and include some substantial blocks of flats.
 6. Taken together policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, and Policies DH1 and H5 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 (the Core Strategy) expect new development to be of a high standard of design that has regard to, and complements, the architecture and built form of the surrounding area. Core Strategy Policy DH(a) seeks to ensure that roof extensions are designed to respect the scale and character of the original building, the street scene and the surrounding area. Further design advice on roof extensions is set out in the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (the SPD) which is to be read alongside the more general design policies in the development plan.
 7. I saw when I visited the site that within the immediately surrounding area there are a variety of roof types including pitched; hipped; flat; and inverted pitch roofs as well as shallow pitched roofs partly concealed by parapets. Dormer windows in various sizes are a common feature. The different building heights and roof forms are part of the character of the area and result in a complex and varied streetscape.
 8. Whilst there is a certain consistency in building height on the four quadrants of the junction of Herbert Road with Eglinton Road and Eglinton Hill, there is a marked difference in architectural style. I noted that the building opposite, at 51 Herbert Road, has been extended at roof level with a pseudo-mansard type roof with dormers that is not dissimilar in appearance to that proposed at the appeal building.
 9. The SPD requires that roofs of new extensions should generally follow and complement the pattern of the main roof, be proportionate to the size of the original house, and that proposals which seek to change the roof form should seek to preserve or enhance the existing appearance in terms of height, scale and visual interest.
 10. Although the Council state that the proposed extension would increase the perceived height of the building and disrupt the established roof form of the terrace, there is an existing roof structure over the side addition. Part of this is at the same height as the ridge of the original house and is visible from street level. The appeal proposal would undoubtedly add to the height of the building. However, continuing the ridge height and roof plane of the original house across the side addition would have a unifying visual effect and carry the building and roof line around the corner more successfully than the present roof structure. The visual effect of the roof slope and dormers would also be reduced by being behind the existing parapet, which is to be retained.

11. Although the existing terrace of houses that the appeal building forms part of has pitched roofs, the proposed roof extension would maintain the current ridge height and front roof plane. At present the appeal building has a hipped roof end which would be retained by the appeal proposal, with the principal increase in the ridge height being on the return elevation of the building to Eglinton Road. The proposed dormer windows would reflect the size and design of the existing dormer window on the front roof slope of the original house and those adjoining it.
12. The new roof structure would be visible from parts of Herbert road and from parts of Eglinton Hill, which rises quite steeply to the south of the appeal building. The present roof structure is also visible from these locations and the effect of the increased height on the return elevation to Eglinton Road would not significantly alter the appearance of the building from these viewpoints. From Eglinton Road looking south, the new side wall and the section of flat roof of the proposed extension would be more visible, as the existing building sits in front of the general building line of this street. However, it would be seen in the context of the large and prominent, flat roofed, dormer windows that are present on number 156 and 158 Eglinton Road and rear elevations of the buildings opposite on Herbert Road which have both a flat parapet and the gables of inverted pitched roofs present. The roof extension to form an additional flat would result in a change in the appearance of the building and surrounding the area. Nevertheless, the appeal site is not within a conservation area, nor is the appeal building nationally or locally listed. Within the varied architectural context and diverse built form of the area, I do not find that this change would be harmful or in conflict with the requirements of the SPD.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would comply with the relevant requirements of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policies DH1, DH(a) and H5 of the Core Strategy and the advice in the SPD.

Other matters

14. It is common ground between the parties that the proposed development would provide suitable living conditions for the future occupiers and would not have any adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of any neighbouring properties. I also note that the Highway Authority have not raised any objections to the proposal. From what I have read and from what I saw when I visited the site, I have no reason to reach a different conclusion on these matters.

Conditions

15. I have had regard to the list of conditions that have been suggested by the Council. In order to provide certainty in respect of what has been granted planning permission, I have attached a condition specifying the approved drawings. To ensure that the proposed development is in keeping with the appearance of the existing building and surrounding area, it is necessary to impose a condition requiring that the materials used match those of the existing building. Policies in the development plan seek to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport and for the provision of cycle parking/storage and refuse/bin storage as part of new developments. Whilst the submitted drawings show cycle storage and refuse storage areas within the curtilage it is

not clear whether this is for the flats that have previously been permitted in the existing side addition or whether these can accommodate the requirements of the proposed additional flat. It is therefore necessary, in order to ensure that adequate provision is made for the new flat, to attach conditions requiring details of these to be provided.

16. The Council have suggested a condition requiring the submission of a noise insulation scheme between the D1 use on the ground floor of the side addition and the proposed new flat. The appellant considers that this condition is not required as there are two floors of residential accommodation between the ground floor and the proposed new flat and, in addition, the previous planning permission for the conversion of the upper floors of the side addition to flats also included a condition in respect of noise insulation between the ground floor and the flats above. I would agree that due to the degree of separation between the ground floor and the proposed new flat this condition is not necessary. Consequently, I have not included this suggested condition.

Conclusion

17. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

John Dowsett

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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 accordance with the following approved plans: PB794 SK009 Rev PR1; PB794 SK010 Rev PR1; PB794 SK011 Rev PR19; PB794 SK012 Rev PR15.
- 3) The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building. All new works and works of making good to the retained fabric shall be finished to match the adjacent work unless otherwise stated on the approved drawings and retained for the lifetime of the development.
- 4) Prior to the first occupation of the studio unit hereby approved, full details of one secure and covered cycle space shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved cycle parking space shall be provided and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development and maintained thereafter.
- 5) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, full details of the refuse storage, recycling facilities and refuse collection arrangements shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The storage and recycling facilities shall in all respects be constructed in accordance with the approved details, before the development is first occupied and shall be maintained for the lifetime of the development.