



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2022

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3RD March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/21/3280170

98A Elliscombe Road, Charlton, London, SE7 7PY

- 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 Mrs Joanna Keith against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/0791/F, dated 3 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of single storey part side infill and rear wrap-around extension with associated alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of single storey part side infill and rear wrap-around extension with associated alterations at 98A Elliscombe Road, Charlton, London, SE7 7PY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/0791/F, dated 3 March 2021, 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 building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 98A_PL(000), 98A_PL(001), 98A_PL(002), 98A_PL(003), 98A_PL(004), 98A_PL(005), 98A_PL(006), 98A_PL(007) and 98A_PL(008).

Preliminary Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more precise than the application form and more closely reflects the submitted plans.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is the ground floor flat of a two-storey end of terrace dwelling that has been converted into two apartments. The building is of traditional appearance, has a two-storey outrigger across part of the rear, and a generous length of rear garden. It is at the end point of the traditional housing run and alongside to the south has appreciably elevated ground and much larger more modern flatted buildings. The flat's rear elevation is not open to public views. The proposal is as described above.
5. The Council is concerned that the depth, design and positioning of the scheme not reflect the stepped character of the dwelling, would erode the setting of the original dwelling, and be generally out of keeping with local character. From my perspective I can entirely see these concerns being applicable in many, if not most, circumstances and certainly a wrap-around approach to an extension is very often unacceptable in character and appearance terms.
6. However, in this instance I consider that there should be a degree of pragmatism; I find the scheme in this particular case would be acceptable. I say this given the unique relationship between this narrow site and the markedly raised ground alongside. The development pattern and character are at transition here and the appeal property is in a rather different context from other traditional homes to the north. Furthermore, the scheme is relatively modest, the property alongside has a rear projection albeit not wrap around, and the original form of the building and outrigger will still be clearly legible from the very limited private angles it is at all visible. Pathway space will remain alongside and interestingly and unusually the wrap around element does not run fully back to the attach to the main rear elevation but stops short in a further differentiation from that normally proposed. In all the circumstances the scheme would be appropriate for this property and its environs.
7. Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) have relevance to the case. Taken together, and amongst other matters, they seek to ensure that development is of good design, sympathetic to and integrating with its host property and surroundings, suitable in form and visual qualities for its context. This is reflected in the advice and objectives of the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD) and it is relevant that this document cannot be expected by way of detailed example or statement to cover every eventuality and is *guidance*.
8. I conclude that the proposal would not conflict with the relevant development plan policies and the pertinent aims of the SPD.

Conditions

9. The Council does not suggest conditions. From my perspective the standard commencement condition along with the requirement for materials to match the existing building would be appropriate; the latter in the interests of visual amenity. There should also be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR