



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2025

by N Bromley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/24/3345842

41A Heathwood Gardens, Greenwich, Charlton SE7 8ES

- 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 Mr Kas Hussain against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 23/3540/F.
 - The development proposed is construction of an L-shape loft conversion to provide two additional bedrooms and a shower room with installation of two rooflights to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of an L-shape loft conversion to provide two additional bedrooms and a shower room with installation of two rooflights to front roof slope at 41A Heathwood Gardens, Charlton, Greenwich, SE7 8ES in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/3540/F, 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, numbered or titled: P003, P004, P005, P006, P007, Site Location Plan and Block Plan.
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 12 December 2024. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling within a long linear row of properties, located on a quiet residential street. The surrounding area is primarily residential in character and includes a mix of housing types.

5. The building has been converted into two self-contained flats, one at ground floor and one at first floor. The proposal would introduce box dormer style windows to the main roof, and the roof of a two-storey outrigger at the rear, providing additional internal living accommodation for the first floor flat.
6. During my site visit I observed numerous examples of box dormer style windows within the rear roof slopes of the terrace properties along the street. A small number of the existing box dormer style windows also extended over a two-storey outrigger. These were comparable to the appeal scheme in terms of their size, form, and appearance.
7. Policy D3 of the London Plan (the LP) and Policy DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (the CS) together and amongst other things, require new development to be high quality and respect the character and form of the host building and the area. Additionally, Policy DH(a) of the CS concerns residential extensions and requires, amongst other things, roof extensions to be designed to respect the scale and character of the host building, street scene and surrounding area. The Council's Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2023 (SPD) sets out at paragraph i.66 that dormers at the rear are generally acceptable, subject to the building typology. However, figure i.37 identifies that L outrigger roof extensions will be refused as they become overbearing and can cause loss of the original pitch of the property's roof.
8. While the proposed box style dormer window would have an L shape design, and it would extend the width of the main roof, it would not extend the full length of the outrigger. The proportions and the stepped height of the proposal would also reduce its bulk and dominance within the roof slope. As such, notwithstanding the guidance of the SPD, in particular figure i.37, it would not overwhelm the overall roof or appear as a top-heavy or overbearing addition to the dwelling.
9. Additionally, the proposal would be viewed within the context of the other similar roof additions within the row of properties, even though they are located further along the terrace. Within this setting, the form and scale of the proposal would not be incongruous or harmful to the character of the row of properties. A condition which secures that the external facing materials match the roof tiles of the main dwelling would also ensure that it has an acceptable appearance.
10. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposal would accord with Policy D3 of the LP and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the CS.

Conditions

11. I have had regard to conditions suggested by the Council, as well as to the Framework and national Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the condition set out in the main issue, it is necessary to impose the standard time limit condition. Also, a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for certainty.
12. The submitted Fire Safety Statement shows how the appellants have considered fire safety as part of the design of the proposal, which is also a separate consideration at building regulations stage. As such, I have not listed it in the plans

condition. Parking provision is also not raised as a concern and the submitted parking provision statement is also not listed.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

N Bromley

INSPECTOR