
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2022

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23RD March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3285316
29 Annandale Road, London, SE10 0DD

- 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 and Mrs Shennan against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/2280/HD, dated 15 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is the formation of a loft conversion incorporating rear dormer window, outrigger dormer, increase of ridge height by 250mm and 2 rooflights to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the formation of a loft conversion incorporating rear dormer window, outrigger dormer, increase of ridge height by 250mm and 2 rooflights to front roof slope at 29 Annandale Road, London, SE10 0DD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/2280/HD, dated 15 June 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: 080/CAR/OS and 029/ANN/001.

Preliminary Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more precise than the application form; I note that the Appellants also use this on the appeal form.

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 a two storey mid terrace dwellinghouse within a road of established residential character. The street scene is pleasing and traditional in
-

appearance with attractive front elevations and roof forms stepping elegantly along the sloping road. The rear garden areas back on to the dwellings fronting the street beyond and rear elevations are not open to public views. The proposal is as described above.

5. The planned works as seen from the front would represent minimal visual change. The roof lights would be acceptable in their own right, frequently appearing along this road. The raising of ridge height to a small degree would hardly be perceptible, continue to relate well to adjoining properties, retain features above the ridge, and not disrupt the important stepping of buildings as perceived from the street.
6. The intended development to the rear is of greater magnitude and might in many, if not most, instances be seen as excessive or lacking an architecturally sympathetic approach. However, the specific context here is very pertinent. I consider that in this instance I cannot ignore the fact that the scheme would almost mirror the out-rigger *paired* property and equally be very similar to works which have been undertaken within a short stretch of homes. I do not know the circumstances behind all the development but it does appear that some were constructed under 'permitted development' (pd) rights and some via specific planning permission.
7. Whatever the planning circumstances the fact is that the built context is now one of markedly extended and altered roof forms in this *immediate* locality. Whether or not the scene is ideal I have to take this on board and I do not see what is to be gained for the public good by refusing the scheme before me in this specific instance. In all the circumstances the scheme would be appropriate for this property and its tight environs. As it happens, in this case the scheme would not fall within pd, but from evidence presented it would appear relatively close to those realms; this is also of some relevance.
8. 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 appropriate design, sympathetic to and integrating with its 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.
9. I conclude that the proposal would not conflict with the relevant development plan policies and the pertinent aims of the SPD.

Conditions

10. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with the requirement for materials to match the existing building. I agree this latter condition would be appropriate in the interests of visual amenity. I also agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty.

Overall conclusion

11. 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