



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3326137

95 Bastion Road, Abbey Wood, Greenwich SE2 0RH

- 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 S. O. Cathain against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0989/HD, dated 21 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is the construction of first-floor side extension, first-floor rear extension and formation of rear Juliet balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of first-floor side extension, first-floor rear extension and formation of rear Juliet balcony at 95 Bastion Road, Abbey Wood, Greenwich SE2 0RH, in accordance with the terms of the application 23/0989/HD, dated 21 March 2023, 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: 4859-108, 4859-106 Rev B, 4859-104 Rev B, 4859-105 Rev B and 4859-107 Rev B.
 - 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.
 - 4) The first floor windows to the en suite bathrooms in the front and rear elevations 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace house, which sits on the outside of a sharp bend in the street. The appeal dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part is in an elevated position from the street. This results in it

sitting significantly higher than the semi-detached pair of houses adjacent, with a more substantial space between the appeal dwelling and the neighbouring house than is evident between other terraces and houses in the rest of the street.

4. The local area is made up of tree lined streets with terraced houses with good sized front gardens, with a few semi-detached properties interspersing. These all appear to originally have been of similar design and scale, but now exhibit a wide variety of extensions and alterations.
5. The proposed first floor side extension, with Juliet balcony to its rear, would sit above an existing single storey side extension that is set back from the front elevation of the original house. The proposed extension would align with the front, rear and side elevation of the existing extension, but with an inset where there is a bevel to the front corner of the existing ground floor extension. The roof of the proposed extension would mirror the hipped roof form of the existing house but would be set approximately 0.3 metres down from the existing roof ridge.
6. The design of the proposed side extension follows the guidance set out in the Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) for side extensions. This advises that they should normally be set back from the front elevation and also step down from the roof of the original house. By doing so, the proposed side extension would appear to be a subordinate addition to the appeal dwelling.
7. The proposed first floor rear extension would be modest in scale and sit above part of an existing flat roofed rear extension. It would be set back from the rear elevation of the existing extension and would mirror its flat roofed form. As such, the proposed side extension would not appear as overly dominant or unsympathetic. Rather, its limited scale and setting in from the rear would result in it appearing as a secondary and complimentary addition that would reflect the design, materials and scale of the existing dwelling.
8. Whilst side extensions are not commonly found in this street of mainly terraced properties, the space between this end of terrace dwelling and its semi-detached neighbour would not be significantly encroached on by the proposal. Its subordinate appearance in relation to the existing dwelling would also result in it appearing as recessive within the existing streetscene, rather than appearing unduly prominent. As such, the proposal would reflect the existing streetscene of the local area.
9. For the reasons given above, I do not find that the proposal would result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area. As such it would accord with policy DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (the NPPF). These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions, demonstrate high quality design, respect the scale and character of the host building and integrate with the local area.

Conditions

10. I have had regard to the Council's suggested condition relating to the restriction of potential use of the flat roofs of the rear extension as a roof

terrace and the creation of an opening to access it. However, I find this would not be directly related to the proposal and/or would potentially limit permitted development rights, for which there are no exceptional reasons. Such a condition would not be reasonable or necessary and would fail the test for conditions set out in the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance.

11. Along with the standard condition for the time limit on implementation of the development, in the interests of design quality I have included conditions requiring compliance with approved plans and materials that match those of the existing building. In the interests of privacy, I have also included a condition requiring obscured glazing.

Conclusion

12. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR