



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 23 November 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2023

Appeal A Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3329712

161 Glenesk Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 1RD

- 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 Jeff Swift against the decision of The Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 23/1977/HD, dated 15 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and rear dormer extension.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3329715

161 Glenesk Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 1RD

- 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 Jeff Swift against the decision of The Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 23/1978/HD, dated 15 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and rear dormer extension.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and rear dormer extension at 161 Glenesk Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 1RD, in accordance with the terms of the application 23/1977/HD, dated 15 June 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: PL01, PL02, PL03, PL04, PL04, PL05, PL06, PL07, PL08, PL09 and PL10.
 - 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.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and rear dormer extension at 161 Glenesk Road, Eltham, Greenwich

SE9 1RD, in accordance with the terms of the application 23/1978/HD, dated 15 June 2023, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL01, PL02, PL03, PL04, PL04, PL05, PL06, PL07, PL08, PL09 and PL10.
- 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.

Preliminary Matters

3. As set out above there are two appeals on this site, which differ only in the detail of the design of proposed rear dormer extensions. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in both appeals is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling.

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is a semi-detached two storey house that has been the subject of an existing loft conversion, comprising front and rear dormer extensions. It is located in a street of similar properties, many of which appear to have undergone significant alteration and extension, including rear box dormer extensions.
6. Appeals have been submitted for proposals that both include the same design of rear ground floor extension but with rear dormer extensions of differing scale and design, which would replace the existing rear dormer. The first (Appeal A) relates to the proposed construction of a flat roofed clay tile hung rear dormer extension, which would be wider, deeper, and taller than existing. This would be set back slightly from the eaves and edges of the roof and down from the roof ridge. The second (Appeal B) also relates to the proposed construction of a flat roofed clay tile hung rear dormer extension, which would be wider, deeper, and taller than existing. This would also be set back slightly from the edges of the roof and down from the roof ridge but would be set well in from the eaves.
7. Due to the collective size of the existing front dormer extension and the rear dormer proposed in both appeals, they do not benefit from permitted development, as allowed by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as Amended) (the GPDO). A planning application is therefore required for such proposals and the appeals before me relate to such planning applications.

Appeal A

8. The proposed rear dormer would replace the existing rear dormer and would only be visible from the rear of the property, where many rear dormer extensions to neighbouring and nearby properties are evident. The Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions

Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (the SPD) advises that full width dormer extensions do not integrate with pitched roof houses and are discouraged by the Council.

9. Such design guidance does however need to be applied to the individual circumstances and contexts. The proposal would not be to the entire width of the roof of the appeal dwelling and would be very similar in scale and design to the dormer extension to the rear roof slope appeal dwelling's semi-detached pair that appears to have been constructed as permitted development in accordance with the GPDO. As the proposal would only be visible from the rear, it appear as a balancing pair with this existing neighbouring rear extension. As such, it would not appear as a dominant and overbearing extension. Rather it would appear to be of the scale and form of rear dormer extensions usually benefiting from the provisions of the GPDO. When considered in the round and in combination with the existing front dormer, the proposed rear dormer would appear as proportionate to the main house.

Appeal B

10. The proposed dormer roof extension that is the subject of this appeal would replace the existing rear dormer extension. It would be as wide and tall as the extension proposed in Appeal A, but would not be as deep, being set well in from the eaves. The proposed rear dormer would be of a smaller scale than the dormer extension on the rear roof slope of the appeal dwelling's semi-detached pair and would be similar in scale and design to the rear dormer extension on the neighbouring semi-detached house at 159 Glenesk Road. This neighbouring dormer would appear to have been constructed in accordance with the permitted development rights afforded by the provisions of the GPDO.
11. Similar to the proposed rear dormer in Appeal A the dormer in this appeal would be slightly set in from the edges of the rear roof slope of the appeal dwelling and would be only slightly narrower than its full width. Whilst the guidance given in the SPD sets out that full width dormer extensions do not integrate with pitched roof houses. Such design guidance does however need to be applied to the individual circumstances and contexts.
12. The proposal would only be visible from the rear, where it would be seen within the context of the many rear dormer extensions on adjacent and neighbouring semi-detached houses, being smaller in scale than the extension allowed under the provision of the GPDO on the rear roof of the appeal dwellings semi-detached pair. As such, the proposed rear dormer would not appear as a dominant and overbearing extension.
13. Rather the proposed rear dormer would appear to be of the scale and form of rear dormer extensions usually benefiting from the provisions of the GPDO and evident in the local area. When considered in the round and in combination with the existing front dormer, the proposed rear dormer would, therefore, appear as proportionate to the main house. As the proposal would only be visible in rear views of the appeal dwelling, and when considered in the round and in combination with the existing front dormer, the proposed rear dormer would appear as proportionate to the main house.
14. The modestly scaled rear ground floor flat roofed extension common to both appeal proposals would be secondary in scale to the appeal dwelling. In combination with proposed rear dormers proposed in both appeals, the

development proposals, when taken as a whole, would appear as proportionate to the appeal dwelling and, therefore, subordinate additions to the appeal dwelling.

15. I find, therefore, that the proposals in both appeals would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The proposals would therefore accord with Policies 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 Framework). These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions, demonstrate high quality design and respond to their context.
16. Whilst both proposed rear dormer extensions are almost to the full width that are the subject of these appeals would not accord with guidance given in the SPD, they do respond to their context and reflect the scale of rear dormers that are allowable under the provisions of the GPDO. I have given significant weight to this in my considerations. Although the proposed extensions in combination with the existing front dormer would be larger than that allowed under the GPDO, allowing the appeals is a proportionate response in the circumstances I have set out above.

Conditions

17. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions, should I be minded to allow the appeals. I have not attached the suggested condition relating to the restriction of potential use of the flat roof of the ground floor rear extension as a roof terrace and the creation of an opening to access it. I find this would not be directly related to the proposal and would potentially limit permitted development rights, for which there are no exceptional reasons. Such a condition would not be reasonable or necessary and would, therefore, fail the test for conditions set out in the Planning Practice Guidance and paragraph 56 of the Framework.
18. Along with the standard condition on implementation, and in the interest of design quality, I have attached conditions to both permissions requiring adherence to approved plans and materials that match those used in the existing building.

Conclusion

19. The appeals are allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR