



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2023

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3316768

23 Clock Tower Mews, Greenwich, Thamesmead, SE28 8FA

- 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 & Mrs Coban against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/3055/HD, dated 12 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey rear extension and double-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single-storey rear extension and double-storey side extension at 23 Clock Tower Mews, Greenwich, Thamesmead, SE28 8FA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/3055/HD, dated 12 September 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: Drg Nos 01-A, 02, 03, 04-A, 05-A, 06-A and 07-A.
 - 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.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr & Mrs Coban against the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matter

3. The application was amended through the submission of revised drawings to narrow the width of the proposed double-storey side extension, to which I have had regard.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey, end-of-terrace dwelling located within a cul-de-sac development of similar style properties within a wider predominantly residential area. The appeal site is on the fringes of this small estate and adjoins a deep grass verge along Oriole Way with semi-mature tree planting and other vegetation adjacent to the plot's boundary. The proposal is for a two-storey side extension with a 3.5m deep single-storey lean-to addition to the rear which would span the full width of the extended property. The side extension would also project forward at single-storey with a lean-to roof that would tie-in with the roof over an existing front projecting porch.
6. The Council has described a 'wrap-around' effect to the rear extension due to its amalgamation with the proposed two-storey side addition that they consider would result in an over-dominant and unsympathetic addition. However, when viewed from the side of the property, the amalgamation of the side and rear extensions would visually perform no different to a single-storey addition set flush with the existing side elevation. The difference merely being the sideways projection of the building as a whole nearer to the plot's side boundary, which in itself I do not find to be harmful. The extended building would not appear cramped in its setting and neither would it intrude beyond any significant building line along Oriole Way.
7. There are no significant numbers of other properties in Clock Tower Mews that have extended across their full width to the rear. However, this does not necessarily indicate harm in this instance. The rear extension would appear proportionate and residential in scale and form, with an appropriate depth and height that I note is considered to be acceptable by the Council. I have been directed to no specific conflict with the part of the Council's *Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018* (SPD) which deals with single-storey rear extensions.
8. The two-storey side extension would appropriately reflect the style of the main house by projecting its form sideways but with a lower ridge height and a set back at first-floor level. Despite the margins of subservience being only slight, in my assessment they would be sufficient to allow the general form of the original house to remain prominent. These factors, together with the side extension measuring less than half the width of the main house, would be compliant with most of the SPD's guidelines for two-storey side extensions.
9. The Council points to the fact that at single-storey the side extension would project forward of the original building line. In this regard, if the original building line is taken to be defined by the two-storey parts of the building and wider terrace, then there would be a technical breach of the SPD's guidelines. However, the single-storey projection would align and tie-in with the existing front porch. No part of the extension overall would project forward of any part of the existing building in a manner that I find would be intrusive or incongruous. Whilst the existing porch projection would be enlarged sideways, its overall size and appearance would compare favourably with a similar projection that spans the boundary between Nos 21 and 22 within the same

terrace, where their original front porches sit side by side in a handed version of each other. The proposal would undeniably add some imbalance to the small terrace of which the appeal property forms part. However, due principally to the noticeably staggered building lines and the irregular placement of buildings around the central roundabout island within Clock Tower Mews, I was unable to detect any sense of regimentation to the street scene or place any significant importance to the symmetry of buildings more generally in the locality.

10. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposal would appear neither over-dominant nor discordant but would be seen as a well-considered and complementary addition. As such, I find no conflict with the aims or objectives of the SPD. Neither do I find conflict with Policies DH1 or DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 or Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021 as far as they require new development, including residential extensions, to achieve high quality design that responds positively to local context through, amongst other things, respect for the scale and appearance of a host building and established development pattern.

Other Matters

11. I have noted the reservations expressed by the neighbouring occupier. The Council has confirmed that the rear extension would satisfy the SPD with regard to neighbouring amenity. There is no substantive evidence to suggest that levels of daylight or sunlight to the rear facing windows at No 22, or to the rear amenity space, would be impacted to any significant degree that would affect the neighbour's living conditions. The extension would be residential in scale and form, without appearing overly dominant or visually intrusive. There is nothing to suggest that the construction works would impact the structural integrity of the neighbouring dwelling. Furthermore, my findings on these matters reflect those of the Council.

Conditions

12. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to ensure that the proposal is finished with materials to match the existing.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of 23 Clock Tower Mews, or the wider area. Accordingly, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR