



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2024

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3344244

9 Raymere Gardens, Plumstead, Greenwich SE18 2LB

- 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 Denise Kamau against the decision of The Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/4106/HD.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey rear extension, replacement of garage with a double storey side extension, hip to gable loft extension with a rear dormer and two rooflights to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a single storey rear extension, replacement of garage with a double storey side extension, hip to gable loft extension with a rear dormer and two rooflights to front roof slope at 9 Raymere Gardens, Plumstead, Greenwich SE18 2LB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/4106/HD, 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: B58165-00-3000 Rev A and B58165-00-3100 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the description of the proposal varies between submitted documents, I have used the description from the Council's decision notice, as this is a full and accurate description that has also been used by the appellant for their statement

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part and that of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a two storey end of terrace house, with the front of the dwelling featuring a two storey bay with gable above and the main roof is hipped to the side. To the front of the property is a good sized front garden and to the side is a detached garage with off street parking for a single car and there is also a good sized garden to the rear.
5. The appeal dwelling is located in an area of similar properties, many of which appear to have undergone significant alteration and extension, including two storey side extensions to end of terrace properties. This lends the area a disparate appearance with limited cohesion between the character groups of short terraces within the street.
6. The Council have recently granted planning permission¹ for the replacement of the detached garage with a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. The council have also recently issued a Certificate For Lawful Use or Development² for permitted development³ for a loft conversion with hip to gable, rear dormer and two front roof lights. From my site visit it was evident that neither of these had been implemented.
7. Under the requirements of the GPDO, these separate extensions could not be implemented in combination under their existing approval and permitted development rights. The appeal proposal is a combination of these two separate proposals.
8. Although the council argues that the appellant has no fallback position with regard to the appeal proposal, it is open to the appellant to implement either of the developments for which an existing permission is in place. I have given this great weight in my consideration of this appeal.
9. The proposed dormer extension does not accord with the design guidance given in the Royal Borough of Greenwich Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2023) (the SPD), which advises in paragraph i.34 that full width dormer extensions do not integrate well with pitched roof houses and in paragraph i.66 advises that dormer extensions be set 0.5 metres in from the roof ridge, eaves and party walls. However, the permitted dormer extension would also not meet these requirements.
10. On balance, I find that the additional roof of the proposed two storey side extension would ameliorate the effect of the proposed full width dormer on the extended gable ended main roof, by providing an additional hipped roof form that would reduce the apparent scale of the dormer in the appeal proposal in relation to the extended roof form of the house as proposed. Although not in accordance with the design Guidance in the SPD for dormer extensions, this is design guidance that should be applied to the individual proposal and context, and I have considered these benefits in relation to the effect of the dormer as permitted development.
11. The proposed change of a gable end for the hipped end of the existing roof is not replicated by a gable end for the proposed side extension. This would be

¹ Planning Ref: 23/3347/HD

² Planning Ref: 23/3348/CP

³ Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B and Class C of Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)

set down from the roof ridge of the main house and would hip with the proposed gable end to the main house, this would result in the proposed extensions appearing as subordinate and secondary additions by reflecting the existing hipped end of the appeal dwelling. This would also reflect the hipped roof form at the other end of the terrace of which the appeal dwelling forms part, and of most of the end of terraces on the street. As such, I do not find that the proposal would result in a discordant and incongruous development or would unbalance the visual appearance of the terrace of which it forms part

12. Although the proposal as a whole would result in a significantly larger house than existing, it would appear that it would result in a house of similar scale to others in the street that have undergone significant extension, including two storey side extensions. As such the proposal would result in the appeal dwelling reflecting the existing streetscene of the local area.
13. For these reasons, I do not find that the proposal would result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part or that of the local area. As such, the proposal accords with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023). Collectively these seek development, including extensions, that is of high quality design, responds to site context and integrates with the local area.

Conditions

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

Conclusion

15. For the reasons above, the appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR