



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2022

by L Douglas BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3280720

68 Burrage Place, Plumstead SE18 7BE

- 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 Muhammad Naeem Mirza against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/1650/HD, dated 8 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'Erection of second floor with mansard roof'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 'Erection of second floor with mansard roof' at 68 Burrage Place, Plumstead SE18 7BE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/1650/HD, dated 8 April 2021, 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 Plan, 20-638-P01, 20-638-P02, 20-638-P03 (Rev. A), 20-638-P04 (Rev. A), 20-638-P05 (Rev. A), and 20-638-P06 (Rev. A).
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the front and rear elevations of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Muhammad Naeem Mirza against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a mid-terrace 2 storey house in a residential area made up of a mix of terraced housing with different finishes. Three storey buildings adjoin the terrace at each end. The short terrace that the appeal building forms

part of has a uniform roofline with a parapet wall to the front and butterfly roofs visible in restricted views from the rear. The butterfly roof form is not entirely consistent in the wider surroundings and does not appear as a distinct or special characteristic of the area.

5. The proposed mansard roof extension would replace the existing butterfly roof layout to the appeal building, but this would only be apparent in views from the rear, where it would be seen in the wider context of a range of rear extensions and roof forms to the terrace and adjoining 3 storey buildings. From the front, in the street scene, glimpses of the proposed development would be seen behind the retained parapet in acute views from along Burrage Place, with clearer views available from the upper floor windows of houses on the opposite side of the street.
6. In all available views, the proposed mansard roof extension would be seen as a modest and proportionate addition to the appeal building which would be different to neighbouring roof forms on Burrage Place. However, its design, form and scale, set back behind the retained parapet, would respect and complement the appeal building and existing terrace. It would appear as a sympathetic addition to the area.
7. The proposed elevation plans state the proposal would be finished with grey wall tiles on the front and rear elevations and other materials to match the existing building. Subject to further details of the tiles being approved prior to the commencement of development, these would ensure a high quality finish to the proposal.
8. Policy DH(a) of the Council's Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) (CS) relates specifically to residential extensions and states new roof extensions should be designed to respect the scale and character of the host building, the street scene and the surrounding area. The Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD) states mansard roof extensions will be appropriate where they would not be harmful to the appearance of the house, amongst other things.
9. The design, form and scale of the proposed development would achieve these aims and would not harm the character or appearance of the area. The proposed development would therefore accord with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the CS and the SPD. These set out that development should be high quality which has regard to existing building forms and proportions and provides a positive relationship between proposed and existing urban context, amongst other things.

Conditions

10. It is necessary to attach conditions requiring the commencement of development within the relevant timeframe and specifying the approved plans in the interests of clarity. Further details of the tiles to be used to finish the front and rear elevations would need to be approved to ensure a high quality finish, appropriate to the area. A condition requiring the approval of those details prior to the commencement of development would therefore be necessary and reasonable in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L Douglas

INSPECTOR