



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2022

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3303545 71 Maze Hill, Greenwich SE10 8XQ

- 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 Ross Clarke against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/1373/HD, dated 21 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable roof conversion, rear dormer extension and installation of 1 rooflight to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a hip to gable roof conversion, rear dormer extension and installation of 1 rooflight to front roof slope at 71 Maze Hill, Greenwich SE10 8XQ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 22/1373/HD, dated 21 April 2022, 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: P-447(22)04, P-477(22)05 and P-477(22)06.
 - 3) The ensuite bathroom window in the rear elevation of the roof dormer extension shall at all times be glazed with obscured glass and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor shall be capable of being opened.

Main Issues

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, local area and the Greenwich Park Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached house located in a cul-de-sac that's forms part of Maze Hill, a street with what appears to be

predominantly residential properties on one side, which runs along the boundary wall on the north-eastern side of Greenwich Park. As well as being located in the CA the appeal property is within the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site Buffer Zone.

4. The appeal property is in a part of the CA recognised for its housing, of which the properties on the Cul-de-Sac form part. The appeal property is not characteristic of the 18th and 19th Century brick terraces, townhouses and buildings that form the main elements of housing on this part of the CA. However, the appeal property and the other housing on the cul-de-sac do speak of the evolution of housing development around the park into the 20th century and provide part of the immediate setting of the park, thereby contributing to the significance of the CA. The CA is a heritage asset to which I have a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
5. Whilst the loft space of the appeal property is already used as living space, the proposal, through the hip to gable conversion at the side and rear of the appeal property and the rear dormer extension, would add additional floorspace and functionality to this use. The proposal would appear to exactly mirror the hip to gable conversion and dormer extension that has already been carried out to its semi-detached pair at 69 Maze Hill, which was allowed on appeal.
6. The proposed rear dormer would be set marginally below the ridge resulting from the proposed hip to gable conversion and would be set in from the roof edges and eaves. In doing so the proposal would appear as a subservient addition to the appeal property, which, along with replicating the hip to gable conversion of its semi-detached pair, would result in the pair having a unified roof form and height. It would, therefore, have the effect of rebalancing the appearance of the semi-detached pair.
7. When seen in the round, the proposal would appear to take into account the local scale of housing development in the wider area and would be consistent with the roof line of its semi-detached pair, and that evident in the cul-de-sac. The proposal would therefore result in the appeal property appearing contextual within the context of the 20th century housing that makes up this part of the CA. As such I do not find that the proposal would be a prominent alteration and addition to the appeal property that would have any significant affect on the streetscene of the local area and I further find that it would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.
8. For these reasons I find that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property or that of the local area and would not cause harm to the significance of the CA. It would, therefore, accord with the Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) and the Greenwich Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2020). Further, the proposal would comply with Policies DH1, DH3, DH(a) and DH(h) of Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014), policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Conditions

9. Along with the standard conditions relating to timing of implementation and compliance with drawings, to protect the living conditions of neighbouring and future occupiers with regard to privacy, I have imposed a condition requiring obscured glazing to the ensuite bathroom in the proposed rear dormer extension.

Conclusion

10. The appeal is allowed

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR