
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 21 September 2021

by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3274273

8 Molescroft, Eltham SE9 3JU

- 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 Temel Djevdet against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/0528/HD, dated 9 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing garage to habitable room and formation of new porch over front door, includes raising height of existing flat roof and forming dummy pitch to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of existing garage to habitable room and formation of new porch over front door, includes raising height of existing flat roof and forming dummy pitch to front elevation at 8 Molescroft, Eltham SE9 3JU in accordance with the terms of application Ref 21/0528/HD, dated 9 February 2021 and subject to the following 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 location and block plan; drawing Nos B 01 Revision 1 and B 02 Revision 1.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality.

Reasons

4. The host dwelling is a two storey semi-detached property with front bow windows at ground and first floor level and an attached flat roof garage to the side which projects forward of the front door and windows of the dwelling.
5. Whilst properties within the street display a sense of commonality with bow windows, rendered finishes and tiled roofs, a number have been extended to the front providing porches to the front door with pitched roofs over them and the adjoining garage/living space, including at No 10, the attached property, whose front porch extension and garage conversion projects slightly forward of the ground floor bow window.
6. Whilst the proposal would project beyond the 2 storey part of the dwelling, its single storey nature, detachment from the bow window and use of matching materials on the roof pitch and walls would ensure that it would be subordinate to the character and appearance of the host property. Furthermore, it would be similar in terms of its siting and appearance to the extension to the front of No 10 and would provide a balance to this pair of semi-detached properties. Moreover, the forward position of the garage to No 14, and the set back of the host dwelling from the road would ensure that the proposed extension would not be unduly prominent in the street scene.
7. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would reflect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality, in accordance with the high quality design and architecture aims of Policy DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (CS), the scale and character aims of CS Policy DH(a) and the local distinctiveness and character aims of The London Plan Policy D3. Although there would be some conflict with the guidance on front extensions and porches contained within the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance in terms of the forward projection of the extension, there would be no conflict with its overall aims of ensuring that extensions are sensitive to the original building and buildings around it, use complementary materials and respect the street scene and character of the area.
8. The Council has referred to CS Policy DH(b) in its decision notice. This policy relates to the protection of amenity for adjacent occupiers and having reviewed the evidence of the Council, this does appear to be a concern. From all that I have seen and read I have no reason to reach a contrary view in this respect. Accordingly, I find that there is no conflict with the aims of this policy.

Conditions

9. To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, a condition is necessary. To protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality a condition controlling external materials is also necessary.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal is allowed with the conditions set out above.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR