



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3311397

21 Belford Grove, Woolwich, Greenwich SE18 5DB

- 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 Chloe Pripachailo against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/2873/HD, dated 28 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion and rear side-return ground floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion and rear side-return ground floor extension at 21 Belford Grove, Woolwich, Greenwich SE18 5DB in accordance with the terms of the application 22/2873/HD, dated 28 August 2022, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The window to the toilet on the second floor of the development hereby permitted 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.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Ms Chloe Pripachailo against the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area, with reference to the proposed rear dormer extension.

Reasons

4. The host dwelling is a two storey palisaded mid terraced house with a two storey bay to the front and a two storey outrigger to the rear. The terrace of which the appeal property forms part is a relatively short run of 8 houses on a no through road that rises up towards its junction with Artillery Place. This slope is reflected in the profile of the terrace, with the houses stepping down in pairs, which results in the terrace having a stepped roof profile.
5. The proposal is for a loft conversion, which includes a rear dormer extension to replace the whole of the rear main roof slope, a pair of roof lights in the front roof slope, and a rear ground floor flat roofed extension that would infill the passage between the outrigger and the boundary to the neighbouring house at 19 Belford Grove (No.19).
6. The boundary of the Woolwich Common Conservation Area (the CA) runs down the middle of the street at Artillery Place and also encloses the area of open water at Musgrave Pond. A large workshop building to the rear of the property and other larger commercial buildings on artillery place do, however, fundamentally screen the appeal property from views from within the CA at this point. The rear position of the proposal would also mean that it would not be significantly visible in views from the public realm towards the CA.
7. The proposed rear dormer would be accommodated by the continuation of the front roof slope so that it would be the same height as the roof of No.19. The proposed rear dormer would align with the additional height of the proposed roof ridge and would align with the existing rear elevation and the party wall upstands between the roofs of the two neighbouring houses.
8. The proposal would remove the existing step down in roof profile from No.19 to the host dwelling and would result in a step down between the roof of the host dwelling and that of 23 Belford Grove, which currently aligns with that of the host dwelling. This proposed increase in the extent of the front roof slope would also result in the roof of the host dwelling no longer aligning with the ridge line of the terrace. Given the stepped nature of the roof ridge of the terrace and the party wall upstands between roofs, this change would be barely apparent.
9. The proposal is similar to that previously dismissed on appeal, but the design of the proposal appears to respond to the reasons given for this refusal and no longer includes a dormer roof extension to the rear outrigger. However, the previous proposal did include the same proposed changes to the extent of the front roof slope.
10. From the Officer report it would appear that the Council have, however, presumed that the Inspector for this earlier appeal and the Council missed that the proposal included a change to the extent of the front roof slope. I find nothing in the material before me to substantiate this. The Officer report also states the proposal would change the angle of the roof slope of the host dwelling. This is not substantiated by the application plans, which clearly show that the front roof slope is extended at the ridge, but with no change in angle. The existing rear roof would be replaced with the proposed dormer.
11. The Inspector for the earlier appeal did not consider that, in isolation, the proposed main rear roof dormer would be materially more harmful than that

built under permitted development rights under the provision of the GPDO¹, which presents a reasonable fallback position for the appellant. I see no reason to demur from this conclusion and find that the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, or that of the local area. Further, with my statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in mind, I find that the scale, screening, the rear positioning of the proposed dormer extension and distance to the Boundary of the CA would not also result in any harm to the setting of the CA.

Conditions

12. Along with the standard condition relating to the timing of implementation, I have attached conditions to ensure design quality, which along with the required compliance with the approved drawings, further requires that materials used for the proposal match those of the host dwelling. To protect privacy, I have also imposed a condition relating to the glazing to the toilet window in the rear dormer extension.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR

¹ The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development etc.) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)