



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2024 by M Long BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3344995

9 Annandale Road, Greenwich SE10 0DD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Jane Denham against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/1077/HD.
 - The development proposed is the existing rear extension to be partly demolished and re-built to extend a further 1.5m into the rear garden; construction of a new loft conversion with rear dormer; ridge of main roof to be raised 225mm in order to achieve adequate internal headroom for a habitable room; and hip to gable conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the existing rear extension to be partly demolished and re-built to extend a further 1.5m into the rear garden; construction of a new loft conversion with rear dormer; ridge of main roof to be raised 225mm in order to achieve adequate internal headroom for a habitable room; and hip to gable conversion at 9 Annandale Road, Greenwich SE10 0DD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 24/1077/HD, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos DD24_01/GA/HPA/001A (Proposed Block Plan), DD24_01/GA/HPA/003A (Proposed Floor Plans), DD24_01/GA/HPA/004A (Existing and Proposed Front and Rear Elevations) and DD24_01/GA/HPA/005A (Existing and Proposed Side Elevations and Sections).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the external surfaces of the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal dwelling has an existing single-storey rear extension and conservatory. It forms a semi-detached pair with 11 Annandale Road (No 11), which has a single-storey rear extension, a hip-to gable conversion and a full-width rear box-dormer. The streetscene contains a variety of traditional houses, including several semi-detached pairs that are characterised by a general symmetry.
5. Given that the proposal would only marginally raise the ridgeline above the level of the attached semi at No 11, this would not appear overly prominent when seen from neighbouring upper floor windows. It would also not be highly perceptible from ground level including to passers-by on Annandale Road due to the elevated height and shallow pitch of the roof, as well as the position of the central chimney stack which would make the stepped ridgeline less noticeable in side-on views.
6. Although the proposed dormer would be larger than the existing dormer at No 11, it would be similar in scale and form and so would not be overly dominant in comparison. It would not meet the general guidance for a 0.5 metre set in from the ridge, sides and eaves as set out in the Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2022 (SPD). Even so, given that several surrounding dormers which are visible from the site utilise the majority of their respective roof slopes, the scale of the dormer would not appear discordant in this context. While not identical to the roof level works at No 11, the proposal would, to some extent, have a rebalancing effect on the roofscape of the pair.
7. The proposed rear extension would exceed the 3.6m projection from the rear that is typically considered appropriate in the SPD for single storey rear extensions. However, it would only project modestly beyond the existing rear extension at the site and the extension at No 11. I acknowledge that the extension would not meet the SPD guidance for the roofline of such extensions to generally be 300mm below the first-floor windowsill. Even so, the SPD recognises that this cannot always be achieved. Moreover, due to the three-storey scale of the host dwelling, the single storey extension would appear subservient and would not unacceptably unbalance the dwelling's fenestration. Furthermore, the overall height would be limited by the flat roof design and, given its discreet position to the rear, would only be visible from a limited number of surrounding properties.
8. Overall, I do not consider that the appeal scheme would conflict with the overarching objectives set out in SPD, including to secure high quality design. In any event, the proposal would have an appropriate design in its context and would accord with the development plan policies outlined below.
9. I conclude that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) specifically Policy DH1 (Design) and Policy DH(a) (Residential Extensions) which together require development to be of a high quality design and have a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality. It would also accord with Policy D3 (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach) of The London Plan (2021) which seeks proposals that respond to the existing character of a place.

Other Matters

10. Concerns have been raised regarding potential harm to a neighbouring mature tree at the boundary with the appeal site. There is no evidence before me to suggest that this tree is covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Nonetheless, the tree does not sit within the footprint of the extension, and the plans do not indicate the development would encroach upon the tree, nor that it would need to be felled. If there were any impacts upon the neighbouring tree, or if works to the tree were required, this would be a private matter between neighbours.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time period for commencement, I recommend a condition to require the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, which is necessary in the interests of certainty. I also recommend that matching external materials are used to preserve the character and appearance of the dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposed development would accord with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR