



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2024

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3337010

47 Holburne Road, Kidbrooke, Greenwich SE3 8HW

- 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 Philip Duckworth against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 23/3216/HD, dated 3 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 28 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension to provide an additional bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension to provide an additional bedroom at 47 Holburne Road, Kidbrooke, Greenwich SE3 8HW in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/3216/HD, dated 3 October 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: PR.01, PR.02, PR.03, PR.04, PR.05 and PR.06
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. Subsequent to the decision made by the Council on the application to which this appeal relates, the Government published the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 19 December 2023. I consider that there have been no major changes relevant to the main issue in this appeal. It will therefore not prejudice any party by making my decision with regard to the revised Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a 2 storey end of terrace house that has been the subject of a recent single storey flat roofed side and rear extension. The planning

- permission for the existing side and rear extension also included a new front porch, to be in the same dark grey brick as the existing extension, but this has not, as yet, been implemented.
5. The local area is residential and is made up of mainly terraced houses with some semi-detached, that form part of a larger planned estate made up of houses of similar scale. Many of these, including the appeal dwelling, appear to have undergone a variety of alterations and extensions and a wide variety of wall finishes and colours are evident in the street and local area.
 6. Whilst the Council have made mention of discrepancies between submitted drawings, I do not find that to be the case and have considered the appeal proposal accordingly. The proposal is for a first floor side extension with a hipped roof, which would sit above the existing side extension and would be constructed in the same dark grey brick. The front of the proposal would align with the front wall of the proposed extension and to the rear would align with the original rear elevation of the appeal dwelling.
 7. The proposal would be substantially set back from the front elevation of the appeal dwelling, to the same extent as the existing side extension, and would be in matching materials. The hipped roof of the proposal would match the pitch of that of the original house. In combination with the relatively small scale of the proposed extension, this would result in the proposal appearing as a secondary and subordinate addition to the appeal dwelling that would accord with the design guidance for extensions set out in the Royal Borough of Greenwich Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2023).
 8. Being substantially set back from the front elevation and down from the roof ridge of the appeal dwelling, the proposal would have a minimal visual presence and weight when viewed from the street. As such, I do not find that the open character between the rows of terraced houses would be significantly affected by the proposal.
 9. For these reasons I find that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property or that of the local area. It would, therefore, accord with Policies DH1, DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 135 of the Framework. These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions, demonstrate high quality design and promote local distinctiveness, avoiding a terracing effect.

Conditions

10. Along with the standard conditions relating to timing of implementation, to ensure design quality I have imposed conditions requiring compliance with approved plans and that materials match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

11. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR