



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3245846

236 Halfway Street, Sidcup DA15 8DW

- 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 Nicholaescu against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
- The application Ref 19/3530/HD, dated 11 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2019.
- The proposed development is demolition of existing side extension and construction of a two storey side/rear extension, single storey rear extension with elevational alterations to include raising the roof ridge height to provide a loft conversion with rooflights.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing side extension and construction of a two storey side/rear extension, single storey rear extension with elevational alterations to include raising the roof ridge height to provide a loft conversion with rooflights at 236 Halfway Street, Sidcup DA15 8DW, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/3530/HD, dated 11 October 2019, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing buildings.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 3519-19-PL001 Rev P3 and 3519-19-PL002 Rev P3.
 4. The extensions hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the side-facing windows at first-floor level have been fitted with obscured glazing. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before these windows are installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.
 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be installed at first-floor level in the side elevations of the extensions.
-

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer 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 proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site accommodates a detached two-storey dwellinghouse on the eastern side of Halfway Street. The surrounding area features residential buildings of varying architectural form and style, including short rows of small dwellinghouses, semi-detached pairs, large detached properties and a block of flats. As such, the character and appearance of the immediate streetscene is heterogenous with no distinct sense of visual uniformity. While the proposed two-storey side extension, single-storey rear extension and loft conversion would result in a larger dwelling relative to the existing proportions of the host property, the resultant dwellinghouse would not appear overtly prominent, bulky or incongruous within such a varied streetscene, particularly within the context of similarly large properties such as Nos. 234 and 232 which lie to the southeast. Furthermore, as the resultant property would retain the existing front gable and mirror it to create a double-gabled front elevation, I consider that the proposal would result in a symmetrical and balanced appearance that would successfully recontextualise the appearance and proportions of the host property and improve the overall character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
5. Although I appreciate that the proposal would involve the loss of the existing cat-slide roof form, I nonetheless consider that the proposal would improve the appearance of the host building, site and streetscene. As the proposed extension would not be forward of the existing front gable and the raising of the roof ridge would be minimal, these elements of the proposal would not appear disproportionate in relation to the scale of the host property.
6. I acknowledge that there are no examples of double-gabled front façades in the surrounding area. Regardless, the resultant property would integrate well within the varied, non-uniform context of the surrounding area.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The proposed development would therefore comply with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), which state that developments must be designed to a high standard, respect the proportions of the host building, and respond positively to local character.
8. The proposal would also broadly comply with the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance SPD (2018), which states that side and rear extensions should be proportionate to the size of the host building.

Other Matters

9. An objection estimates that the resultant property would lower daylight levels to a neighbouring property by 35%. However, there is no robust evidence before me to suggest that the proposal would cause any unacceptable harm to neighbouring occupants, and I find that the proposal would be acceptable in this regard. Furthermore, given the limited scale of the proposed demolition works, I do not consider it likely that these works would cause damage to the property of neighbouring occupants.

Conditions

10. The conditions which are imposed are mostly those which have been suggested by the Council, but with some variation in the interest of clarity and precision having regard to the advice on imposing conditions in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.
11. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the scheme be built in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt.
12. The Council have suggested a condition requiring that the external surfaces to be used in construction should match those used in the existing building. I consider that such a condition would be necessary in order to ensure that the proposal would respond positively to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
13. The Council have also suggested a condition requiring that the side-facing windows would need to be obscurely glazed. I have imposed this in order to maintain the privacy of the adjoining occupiers. For the same reason I have also attached a condition to prevent the insertion of any further windows in the side elevation of the extension.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR