



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2021

by Michael J Muston BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 February 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3260129

6 Senator Walk, Thamesmead SE28 0EH

- 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 Valdas Kersevicius against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 20/1845/HD, dated 25 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a double storey side extension 3.0m wide.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a double storey side extension 3.0m wide at 6 Senator Walk, Thamesmead SE28 0EH, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/1845/HD, dated 25 June 2020, and the plans submitted with it, 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 dwelling.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: site location plan, block plan and drawings numbered 101 and 301.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No 6 Senator Walk is at the end of a terrace of seven two storey houses. Both this terrace, and the adjacent one comprising Nos 1-5 Senator Walk, have layouts whereby the central houses in the terrace are the furthest forward, with houses to the sides stepping back from this line and including rooves that gradually step down. No 5 has a single storey side extension that follows the same pattern.
4. The appeal proposal would continue this pattern, being set back and set down from the rest of No 6, in the same way that No 6 steps back and down from No

7. It would appear as a natural progression of the terrace and, despite being in a prominent position alongside the footway, would fit in well with its surroundings.
5. The proposed extension would comply with Policy DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) (CS), which requires new development to be of a high quality and to positively contribute to the improvement of both the built and natural environment. As sought by the policy, the proposal would complement the architecture of surrounding buildings and the established layout and character of the area. It would also comply with Policy DH(a) of the CS, which says that residential extensions should be limited to a scale appropriate to the building and locality.
6. The Council has adopted a Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which deals with side extensions in paragraphs 5.26 – 5.29. As suggested in the SPD, the proposed extension accurately reflects the style of the main house, and would remain secondary in size and appearance, by being set back and set down. It would have a roof with a pitch that reflects the roof pitch of the existing house, and which would be set below the existing house's ridge height. It would also be set back from the front wall of the main house, thereby allowing the existing house to remain prominent. It would have a height and width that would be proportionate to the main house.
7. The only element of the advice in the SPD that the proposal would not meet is the sentence that "*The width should be less than half the width of the main house*". However, this is guidance and does not need to be slavishly followed. In this case, the intention of the advice in the SPD is met, in that the proposed extension would appear subservient to the main house, by being set back and down from it. Its width would be significantly less than that of No 6, which itself is significantly less wide than the adjoining section of the terrace comprising Nos 6 and 7. The proposed extension would not harm the appearance of the terrace within the street scene.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, and would comply with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, which seek development that has regard to the form, function and structure of an area and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings, as well as with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the CS.

Conditions

9. As well as standard conditions relating to when the development should commence and compliance with the approved plans, a condition requiring the external materials used to match the existing building is necessary, to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

Michael J Muston

INSPECTOR