



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 7 June 2021

by Mark Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/20/3257550

79 Eastcombe Avenue, Charlton SE7 7LL

- 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 Peter Dhillon, c/o Building Design & Services Ltd against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 20/0707/F, dated 25 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as "addition of rear dormers for development granted under planning ref: 17/1441/F. Ref: 1062536".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for development described as "addition of rear dormers for development granted under planning ref: 17/1441/F. Ref 1062536" at 79 Eastcombe Avenue, Charlton SE7 7LL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/0707/F, dated 25 February 2020, and subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted relates to approved plans, reference Lp-00L and ER 1912/1B.

Procedural Matters

2. It was clear from my site visit that the development has been carried out. I have considered the appeal scheme accordingly.
3. The London Plan March 2021 was published subsequent to the submission of the appeal and replaces the London Plan 2016. The main parties were given the opportunity to comment on the relevance of this to the appeal. I have had regard to any comments received and the new London Plan in my decision.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal building is a part two and part three storey modern property in a residential area. It is part of a row on the western side of Eastcombe Avenue and contains six apartments. The design of the building incorporates a large three storey pitched roof outrigger to the rear. The surrounding area comprises mainly two storey terraced properties. A common feature being rear outriggers. Along this stretch of Eastcombe Avenue the rear elevations of properties are not readily visible, other than when in their rear gardens. This is true of the appeal site itself.

6. The Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (SPD) states that dormer extensions should be small scale and the windows should be of an appropriate design considering the other windows in the house, and rear dormer extensions of an appropriate scale are acceptable. The SPD goes on to advise that full width dormer extensions will be discouraged.
7. Even so, the proposed dormers do not extend across the full width of the roof slope as they are set in from either end of the building with a large gap in between. They are also set well back from, and above, the eaves, and are not any higher than the existing main ridge of the building. Given these factors, I consider that the dormers are of an appropriate scale and do not dominate the rear roof slope of the property. Furthermore, the dormers have been constructed in materials to match the appearance of the roof of the property.
8. Rear dormer extensions are not an uncommon feature to properties on Eastcombe Avenue or the surrounding area generally. Two such examples are the dormers to the rear of Nos 31 and 33 Bramshot Avenue to the south, which face in the direction of the appeal site. Whilst many of the dormers in the area may have been constructed under permitted development rights, they do nevertheless form part of the character and appearance of the area.
9. The dormers are not visible from Eastcombe Avenue due to their siting on the rear roof slope. Viewed from the rear gardens of the appeal property, the dormers are barely discernible due to their height above ground level and position behind the rear walls of the projecting outrigger, which remains the dominant element at the rear of the property. Given the position of the property relative to neighbouring buildings, and the established trees to the rear of the site, the dormers are not prominent from surrounding areas. Trees also largely screen the development from more distant views to the west, including from the A102.
10. With the above in mind, the development is not harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. I therefore find no conflict with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (adopted in July 2014), or the aims of the Council's SPD. Amongst other things, these require residential extensions to be of a scale and design appropriate to the character of the building and the surrounding area. In addition, I find no conflict with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021, which, amongst other matters, require development to respond positively to local distinctiveness and seek to achieve high quality design.

Conditions

11. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions. As the development has already taken place, conditions relating to the standard implementation period, and use of matching materials, are unnecessary. I have however, for clarity and enforceability, set out the approved plans.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed, subject to the stated condition.

Mark Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR