



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2024

**by M Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 23 October 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3342078**

**8 Halsbrook Road, Kidbrooke, Greenwich SE3 8QY**

- 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 Irine Katsiashvili against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
  - The application Ref is 23/3754/HD.
  - The development proposed is construction of a first floor rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a first floor rear extension at 8 Halsbrook Road, Kidbrooke, Greenwich SE3 8QY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/3754/HD, subject to the following condition:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL-11 Proposed Plans, PL-12 Location and Block Plan and PL-13 Rev A 3D Views.

## Preliminary Matter

2. During my site visit I was able to see that the proposal had been part constructed but not completed. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the plans that were before the Council.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal property is a brick built end terraced dwelling within a residential area. It is situated in a row of properties which are set back from the road behind driveways and front gardens. The area is characterised by linear rows of similar two storey properties which gives the area a relatively uniform character. Although the roof of the appeal property has been extended to form a gable end, neighbouring properties generally have hipped roofs. The property is located on an irregularly shaped plot on the corner of the road, with a green open space to the side. As a result, the side elevation of the property is prominent in the street scene.
5. The proposed first floor extension spans about half the width of the property and is set back from the rear elevation of the existing single storey extension

below. The eaves is in line with the eaves of the existing house and its hipped roof set well below the ridge of the property.

6. The Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that double storey rear extensions are not normally supported where the existing building has two storeys or less, and such extensions should maintain appropriate distances between the roof of the extension and the eaves of the existing building. The proposal does not strictly accord with the SPD in these respects. However, due to the large box dormer to the rear roof slope and the hip to gable extension, the rear of the property appears as a three storey building and the rear eaves are not as apparent. The scale and height of the proposal are such that it is clearly subservient to the property. Moreover, lack of conformity with the provisions of SPDs is not the same as conflict with development plan policies, and the SPD provides guidance only.
7. Previous extensions to the property, including the hip to gable, dormer and single storey extensions, have markedly altered the appearance of the property and the uniformity of the terrace, such that the proposed extension does not have a significant effect on any remaining uniformity. Nor does it, either by itself or in combination with previous additions, result in over-development of the original building, which remains the dominant element.
8. The hipped roof above the extension is sympathetic to the character of the area. Although the hipped roof sits above the eaves level of the property and is integrated into the box dormer window, this is not harmful to the character and appearance of the property given that it is a modest addition which sits comfortably against the rear of the property.
9. While first floor rear extensions are not a common characteristic of the area, in this case I find that the proposal is not harmful. The Council refers to the refusal of a planning application for a first floor rear extension at 1 Halsbrook Road. However, as details of that proposal have not been provided, I cannot be sure that it is comparable to the appeal scheme which I have determined on its own merits.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal scheme is not harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. Therefore, it complies with Policy D3 of the London Plan and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is of a high quality design that responds to local distinctiveness and character.

### **Conditions**

11. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans is necessary to provide certainty. The Council's suggested conditions relating to commencement and materials are unnecessary due to the stage reached in construction and the details provided on the plans.

### **Conclusion**

12. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*M Ollerenshaw*

INSPECTOR