



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2025

by **C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3351342

145 Broad Walk, Kidbrooke, London, SE3 8NF

- 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 Ali Khan against the decision of the Council of The Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/1718/HD.
 - The development proposed is described as 'first storey side and rear with layout redesign'.
-

Preliminary matters

1. I consider the Council's description of the proposed development as contained on their Decision Notice to be more accurate than that on the application form and so have determined this appeal on that basis, namely 'construction of a first floor side extension, part one/part two storey side and rear wraparound extension with four rooflights, removal of chimney stack and all other associated external works'.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a first floor side extension, part one/part two storey side and rear wraparound extension with four rooflights, removal of chimney stack and all other associated external works at 145 Broad Walk, Kidbrooke, London, SE3 8NF in accordance with the terms of the application ref 24/1718/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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building
 - 3) Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), the new first-floor side windows to be installed in the side elevation of the two-storey side extension hereby approved shall be fitted as obscure glazed, fixed shut and retained as such for the lifetime of the development.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A-01 REV 00, A-02 REV 00, A-10 REV 00, A-11 REV 00, A-20 REV 00, A-21, REV 00, A-30 REV 00, A-31 REV 00 & A-32 REV 00.

Reasons

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
4. The appeal property is a semi-detached house with a catslide roof, which is also seen on the attached house. I saw at my site visit that Broad Walk contains a mix of semi-detached houses with considerable variation in design and form. There are pairs of houses with similar catslide roofs, along with more conventional two-storey houses that vary with gable frontages, bay windows, hipped roofs, and pitched roofs. There is a sizable gap between the house and the boundary of No. 147, with then a further gap to that house.
5. Many houses have been altered and extended at ground and first floor level, both to the rear and to the side. This includes within close proximity to the appeal site certain houses with catslide roofs, where I saw a number of first floor side and rear extensions. Such extensions differ in their detailed design approach, but where they have been undertaken with a set-back from the front elevation and lower ridge height than the original property such extensions appear of reasonable proportions to the main house, leave a spacious impression to the house and area, and do not result in a terracing effect upon the area.
6. The proposed extension at first floor would be set back from the front elevation and notably lower than the main ridgeline of the house. The roof pitch for the extension would be suited for the host property and the wider area which, as noted, sees a wide variety in roof forms. The design, scale and siting of this extension would preserve a spacious appearance around the house, with views through to the rear garden area retained. The gap between the property and the neighbouring house at No. 147 would be reduced, but there would not be an impression of terracing as a good distance would remain between the two buildings at first floor and ground floor.
7. The extension would be to only one half of the pair of semi-detached houses. Whilst this would affect the degree of symmetry between the two properties, this would be of minimal effect due to the set-back of the extension which means the extension is not visually dominant to the pair when viewing from the street. In any event, I saw there are many examples on Broad Walk where pairs of houses are no longer symmetrical due to many alterations and extensions. As a consequence it is clear to me that symmetry is not a defining characteristic of this area and the proposed extensions would be seen in that context; the limited diminishment of symmetry arising from this appeal is not harmful to that character.
8. The extensions to the rear of the property would increase the width of the house, and this would be attached to the side extension. Although the appearance of the house would change, the original core of the house would still be apparent, with the scale and proportions of the extension not appearing excessive for the host property. The extensions would be a clear later addition to the house, and in the limited visibility of the rear and side extensions this would be seen as appropriate in scale and form for the house, the plot and the area.
9. The proposed development would be of a scale and design appropriate for the host property and the area, which would not be harmful to the open character of the area nor imposing upon the building or adjoining properties. Thus, the proposals

would be consistent with the objectives of seeking good design as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, and there would be no conflict with the relevant development plan policies, namely Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), whose general aim is to seek to ensure residential extensions are of a scale and design appropriate to the area.

10. The Council's Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (2023) (SPD) is a material consideration, and this notes that two storey side extensions are likely to have a greater impact on the character and setting of the street, and so they must be designed so as to avoid a terracing effect or loss of open character. The SPD continues to say that two storey side extensions to semi-detached houses will not be supported. In this instance I have found that there would not be a harmful impact on the host property, the pair of properties, or on the character and setting of the street. Hence, there would not be a terracing effect and open character would not be lost, and so the considerations in this case mean the two storey extension can be supported. The SPD further requires single storey and two rear extensions to, amongst other matters, respond appropriately to the scale of the existing building and size of garden, and to not overwhelm the existing building. I similarly find that, in this instance, the proposals would not conflict with these objectives.
11. The proposed development would accord with the policies of the development plan and not conflict with the objectives of the SPD, and so the appeal is allowed. I have attached the suggested conditions regarding materials to be used, to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development. In the interests of privacy I have attached the condition relating to the obscure glazing of the first floor window in the north elevation. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary in the interests of precision.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR