



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2020

by Patrick Hanna MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3252555

26 Meridian Road, Charlton, London SE7 8QJ

- 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 Ali against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0652/HD, dated 25 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as revised application to 19/2872/HD - demolition of the existing conservatory and erection of a part one, part two storey side and rear extension and installation of rooflights to front and rear roof slopes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of the existing conservatory and erection of a part one, part two storey side and rear extension and installation of rooflights to front and rear roof slopes at 26 Meridian Road, Charlton, London SE7 8QJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/0652/HD, dated 25 February 2020, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey, end-of-terrace dwelling, within an area that is residential in character with properties of mostly similar character and appearance. The effect of the proposal would be to erect a side and rear extension with setback from the building line and lower height than existing.
4. A similar proposal at the appeal site was subject to a previous appeal decision¹. Whilst full details of that proposal are not available to me, that Inspector concluded that the proposal would be harmful. Firstly, the proposed roof was not set below the existing ridge height; secondly, the setback was limited at first floor level and non-existent at ground floor level; and thirdly that the side extension would be prominent and dominant within the street scene, such that the proposal failed to be subservient to the host dwelling.
5. The current proposal now involves a ridge height that is less than existing, and the full height of the proposed extension has been set back by some 400 mm

¹ Appeal decision APP/E5330/D/19/3239566 dated 2 February 2020.

from the front building line. Whilst these amendments are limited in their extent, they would nonetheless ensure that the frontage of the proposed extension would read as being subservient to the host dwelling and the wider terrace. This being the case, the two-storey rear projection, which is substantially lower in height again than either the existing or proposed ridge heights, would also be seen as being similarly subservient.

6. The side elevation of the proposed extension would be visible as a whole from the Canberra Road end of Meridian Road. However, from here, the lower ridge height and elevational setback of the frontage element of the proposal would be clearly evident against the existing terrace, such that the proposal would not read as over dominant. The lower height again of the two-storey rear projection would visually break down the bulk of this element, notwithstanding the depth of the proposal. Furthermore, from this particular vantage point, the proposal would be seen in the context of a substantial garage to the foreground such that the rear projection of the proposal would be relatively recessive.
7. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal complies with policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), and the Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basement and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018). Together these require that new development is of high quality design that positively contributes to the improvement of the built environment.

Conditions and conclusion

8. A condition detailing the approved plans is required for certainty. To maintain the character and appearance of the host building, a condition in respect of matching materials is also necessary.
9. For the reasons given, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Patrick Hanna

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: Site Plan; 1904_01-01 (Existing Plans); 1904_10-01 REV A (Proposed Side Elevation & Section); 1904_02-01_REV B (Proposed Plans); 1904_02-02_REV B (Roof Plans); 1904_02-03_REV C (Front and Rear Elevations); and 1904_02-04 Rev C (Side Elevations).
- 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials to match those used in the existing building.