



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2024

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

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 09 April 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3333439**

**9 The Heights, Charlton, Greenwich SE7 8JH**

- 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 Vincent Delecroix against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
  - The application Ref 23/2318/HD, dated 11 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2023.
  - The development proposed is the construction of a hip to gable extension and rear dormer roof extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a hip to gable extension and rear dormer roof extension at 9 The Heights, Charlton, Greenwich SE7 8JH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/2318/HD, dated 11 July 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: B188677-3100 Rev A and B188677-3000 Rev A
  - 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, on 19 December 2023 the Government published the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). 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.
3. As the description of development varies between documents submitted for the purposes of this appeal, I have used the description from the Council's decision notice, as this is an accurate and concise description of the proposed development.

4. Also subsequent to the decision made by the Council on the application to which this appeal relates, the council adopted the Royal Borough of Greenwich Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2023) (the SPD). Amongst other matters, this replaces the design advice set out in the Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018). I consider that there have been no major changes relevant to the main issue in this appeal and I have therefore had regard to the recently adopted SPD in making my decision.

### **Main Issue**

5. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the semi-detached pair of houses of which it forms part, as well as that of the local area.

### **Reasons**

6. The appeal dwelling is a 2 storey 3 bedroom semi-detached house with a hipped roof, located in a predominantly residential area made of semidetached houses of similar scale, along with a large development of modernist residential properties, which stands in stark contrast to the traditional semi-detached houses.
7. The appeal dwelling and its semi-detached pair are located on plots that widen to the rear, with street frontages that are narrower than the front elevations of the dwellings. Following the widening of its plot to the rear, the footprint of the appeal dwelling also widens and steps out twice towards the boundary with the neighbouring house at 7 The Heights.
8. The design guidance in the Royal Borough of Greenwich Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2023) advises against hip to gable extensions and alterations. This is, however, advice to be applied to individual contexts and circumstances. In this case it is only the rear part of the roof that would be affected by the proposed hip to gable alteration and extension, where the rear parts of the appeal dwelling steps out sideways. This would result in a gable end flank wall that would align with the flank of that part of the house that steps out first. This would also result in that part of the house that steps out at its widest having a narrow mono-pitch roof above.
9. The rear position and modest scale of the hip to gable change would not result in it appearing as dominant or overbearing, or substantially change how the appeal dwelling appears when viewed from the street. In these views, the proposal would result in the appeal dwelling retaining its front hipped roof form and would retain the existing balanced appearance with its semi-detached pair.
10. The proposed rear dormer would not extend to the full width and height of the rear roof slope that would be widened by the proposed hip to gable extension. Rather, it would be set in from the ridge and edges and verge of the extended rear roof slope. As such, the proposed rear dormer would not be visible in street views but only in rear views of the appeal dwelling. Due to its scale, extent and positioning, the proposed dormer extension would not, therefore, appear as a bulky addition that would dominate the appeal dwelling.
11. For these reasons, I do not find that the proposal as a whole appears as an overbearing or incongruous addition to the appeal dwelling but would appear as a secondary and subordinate addition to the appeal dwelling and the semi-

detached pair. The proposal would not, therefore, result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the semidetached pair of which it forms part or to that of the local area.

12. As such, the proposal accords with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the of Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 135 and 139 of the Framework. These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions, demonstrate high quality design, respond to site context and integrate with the local area.

### **Conditions**

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

### **Conclusion**

14. The appeal is allowed.

*Victor Callister*

INSPECTOR