



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 29 September 2020 by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston MA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3251063

72 Barth Road, LONDON, SE18 1SQ

- 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 Sam Armour against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 20/0417/HD, dated 7 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is the Erection of ground floor side return and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of ground floor side return and rear extension at 72 Barth Road, LONDON, SE18 1SQ, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 20/0417/HD, dated 7 February 2020 and 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: Block plan, Proposed Elevations 03 Revision D, Proposed plans 02 Revision B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development, hereby permitted, shall match those used in the existing building.

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 effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. No. 72 is a two-storey terrace dwelling located in a residential area of similar properties. To the rear is a two-storey addition which covers part of the rear elevation and which is paired with the neighbour at No. 70. This leaves a side passageway to the shared boundary with No. 74.

5. Many of the properties in the terrace have retained the traditional rear additions which provide a sense of uniformity and rhythm to the rear elevations. However, many of these appear to have been extended and externally altered at ground floor level with variations in the style and size giving the rear of the terrace a varied profile.
6. The proposal seeks to extend out beyond the existing addition and infill the space between the shared boundary with No. 74. This would result in a wraparound extension covering the width of the rear elevation at ground floor.
7. The overall depth of the proposal running along the shared boundary with No. 74 appears excessive when considered on its own, however, in the broader context of the site and when considering the existing rear addition, its design, size and form ensures that it would appear subservient to the predominant form of the two storey L-shaped rear addition of the main building. Moreover, its overall projection into the rear garden is broadly consistent with other single storey rear extensions in the terrace, albeit the stepped elevations in the main are retained.
8. I accept that the rear finished building would not be in full conformity with the prevailing pattern in the same terrace where single storey extensions have retained an element of the stepped elevation. However, the prevailing characteristic of the rear terrace is varied as a result of the plethora of built additions along it at ground level. The proposal would not look out of place because it would be compatible in its context.
9. Whilst at ground floor the stepped elevation would be lost, it would still remain the predominate visual aspect at first floor. Views of the ground floor element would be limited to a few neighbouring properties, given the siting of the property adjoining the large gable wall of the temple, along with the separation afforded by the back gardens with trees, which provide some screening. Moreover, given the overall height of the proposal the change resulting from the appeal proposal would be minor and not draw the eye.
10. Whilst the proposal would, on the face of it, conflict with the advice in the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (2018) (SPD) regarding 'Infill extensions', the proposal would not harm the neighbouring property or the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, a concern which the SPD seeks to address. In addition, as it remains subservient to the original dwelling and would not appear as a dominant feature in the streetscape the proposal is considered to comply with the fundamental aims of the SPD which seeks new development proposals to be sensitive to the original building and respects the character of the area.
11. The Council note that the irregularity in the pattern of development along this part of the terrace is due in part to previous planning permissions granted prior to the adoption of the most up to date development plan policies and SPD. There is nothing before me to suggest that the aims of the previous policies were so fundamentally different to those in the updated adopted policies, moreover, as noted, those previously approved developments now form part of the established character of the area. I therefore attach limited weight to this line of argument.

12. Overall, the above factors lead me to conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would comply with Policies DH1 and DH (a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) which seeks to ensure that development is of high quality that relates to its context, and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan which seek in various ways, to ensure that development respects the character of an area.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings and to require that the development is carried out in accordance with them as this provides certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the finished building, a condition is attached to require that the external materials match those of the existing dwelling

Conclusion

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

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspectors Decision

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

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR