
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2022

by E Grierson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3289131

34 Disraeli Close, Thamesmead, Greenwich SE28 8AP

- 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 Ion Apostolescu against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/2937/HD, dated 16 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of an existing garage into a habitable room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of an existing garage into a habitable room at 34 Disraeli Close, Thamesmead, Greenwich SE28 8AP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/2937/HD, dated 16 August 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: PA1, PA2 and PA3.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials that match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host terrace and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is occupied by a three-storey terrace dwelling with a single storey attached garage projecting from the front elevation. The dwellings within the host terrace and surrounding area are similar in scale and appearance, with a characteristic three-storey, flat roof style and a single storey projection to the front, giving the properties a relatively uniform appearance.
4. In the immediate area around the appeal site, including the host terrace, the garage doors have been retained on the properties. However, whilst commonplace, the garage doors themselves do not form a particularly distinctive feature and make a neutral contribution to the streetscene.

5. The proposed loss of the garage door, and its replacement with a window, would alter the appearance of the host dwelling. However, this alteration would be minimal and would not significantly change the properties visual contribution to the overall terrace. The scale and form of the building would remain as existing and the proposal would not impact upon the characteristic building style or general uniformity. As such, the loss of the garage door would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the terrace or the surrounding area.
6. Whilst the presence of a window, to replace the garage door, would deviate from the prevailing pattern of development, the size and design of the proposed window would be in keeping with the host dwelling and surrounding properties. It would therefore not appear as an incongruous addition within the streetscene.
7. Consequently, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host terrace or the surrounding area and would comply with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021). These policies collectively seek to ensure that all development is a high quality of design and of a scale appropriate to the building and locality, with development proposals responding to the existing character of a place.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have attached a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty and precision. A condition requiring the use of materials matching that of the existing building is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, the appeal is allowed.

E Grierson

INSPECTOR