



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3307265

37 Elliscombe Road, Charlton, Greenwich SE7 7PF

- 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 Ms M J Chu against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/1690/HD, dated 17 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2022
 - The development proposed is the construction of a dormer roof extension comprising Juliette balcony to the rear slope, together with a dormer roof extension to the rear outrigger, installation of three rooflights to the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a dormer roof extension comprising Juliette balcony to the roof slope, together with a dormer roof extension to the rear outrigger, installation of three rooflights to the front roof slope at 37 Elliscombe Road, Charlton, Greenwich SE7 7PF in accordance with the terms of the application 22/1690/HD, dated 17 May 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: 4706-304, 4706-305, 4706-306, 4706-307, 4706-308, 4706-309, 4706-310 and 4706-3-11,
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area, with reference to streetscene.

Reasons

3. The host dwelling is a two storey palisaded terraced house with a gable end, on a street of similarly scaled terraced and semi-detached late 19th Century houses. The host dwelling backs on to an area of densely overgrown back-land. The host dwelling has been the subject of an earlier single storey rear wrap around extension to an outrigger.

4. The proposal is for an extension that would involve dormer extensions to the rear roof of the house and another to the roof of the outrigger. Planning permission was previously refused by the Council for a proposal involving, amongst other matters, a dormer extension to the outrigger that would extend to the full length of the outrigger, some 2.8 Metres deeper than that proposed by the appeal proposal. The proposal appears to be the appellant's attempt to overcome the reasons for refusal given by the Council for this earlier application.
5. I note that, subsequent to the Council's refusal of planning permission for the appeal proposal, a Certificate of Lawful Development was issued by the Council for a similar proposal for dormer extensions, but with a smaller dormer extension proposed to the outrigger, confirming that this was in accordance with the national Permitted Development requirements.
6. The flat roof of the proposed dormer to the rear main roof slope would align with the existing roof ridge, with a set back from the eaves of approximately 0.3 Metres. Given this proposed positioning and the close proximity of the host dwelling to the adjacent end of terrace house, the proposed rear dormer would not be readily apparent in street views. It would only have a sliver of visibility in the narrow gap between these two properties and only from one small section of the street, from where the proposed flat roof would not be visible.
7. The proposed narrower dormer extension to the outrigger would be entirely set behind the host dwelling and would only be visible in views from the rear. This extension would extend to approximately half the length of the roof of the existing outrigger, appearing to align and adjoin with an existing outrigger extension to the neighbouring house at 39 Elliscombe Road.
8. In this regard, the proposed rear extensions, which would be clad in roof slates to match the existing roof, would integrate well with the rear roofs of the host dwelling, and would not result in an overbearing visual effect, but would appear as a subservient addition to the host dwelling. The proposal would therefore be in accordance with the design guidance given in the Council's residential extensions supplementary planning document¹.
9. The opening at the rear of the proposed main roof dormer to accommodate a Juliet balcony, would be larger than the existing window openings in the rear elevation. The rear window in the proposed outrigger extension would match the size of the existing window in the elevation below, albeit as a single pane without any proposed transoms. Along with the proposed rooflights to the front roof slope, the design of these proposed elements is entirely commensurate with the loft dormer type of extension proposed and would not appear as discordant elements.
10. For these reasons, I do not find that the proposal would result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
11. As the proposed extension is to the rear of the property and the host dwelling backs onto an area of overgrown back-land, it would only be wholly visible from the rear gardens of other neighbouring properties in the street. Given the rear context of the extensive neighbouring outriggers and existing rear extensions,

¹ Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016)

including dormer extensions, the proposal would appear to accord with the roofscape of the rear of the properties in the street and the back-land context.

12. Bearing in mind the extremely limited street views of the proposal, that I have identified above, and the limited rear views that would be afforded of the proposal, it would not appear as an unduly prominent feature in the local roofscape or streetscape and would not result in any significant harm to the streetscape or to the character and appearance of the local area.

Conditions

13. Along with the standard conditions relating to timing of implementation and compliance with drawings, in the interest of design quality I have imposed a condition requiring the use of materials in construction that match to those of the existing house.

Conclusion

14. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR