



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2025

by Samuel Watson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/24/3347744

130 Eastcombe Avenue, Greenwich, Charlton SE7 7LW

- 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 Katee Goldstein against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/0177/F.
 - The development proposed is construction of a loft conversion with rear dormer extensions with a balcony, two rooflights to front elevation, internal alterations, floor plan redesign and all associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a loft conversion with rear dormer extensions with a balcony, two rooflights to front elevation, internal alterations, floor plan redesign and all associated works at 130 Eastcombe Avenue, Greenwich, Charlton SE7 7LW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/0177/F, 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 drawings: Location Plan, B212617-3000 rev A, and B212617-3100 rev A.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development above has been taken from the appeal form as this more accurately describes the works proposed under this scheme. I note the Council also used this description in their decision notice.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a residential area primarily comprised of terraces with two-storey outriggers. The appeal dwelling itself is formed of the upstairs maisonette which also has access to the roof space. Although the properties along Eastcombe Avenue and the wider area are broadly similar in design, I noted a number of examples of rear extensions and alterations which create a sense of individuality.

5. In particular, I noted a number of box dormers visible from Sandtoft Road on the rear elevations of properties on Eastcombe Avenue. From views within and at the back of the appeal site I noted further box dormers on the rear elevations along Sandtoft Road. While some of these dormers appeared to follow the Council's guidance, a number covered the whole of the rear roof slope. Whilst I am mindful that these examples may have been installed prior to the adoption of the Royal Borough Greenwich Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) or under permitted development rights, I nevertheless find that rear dormers are characteristic of the area.
6. Moreover, during my visit I viewed the appeal site from a number of points along Sandtoft Road. Due to the position of the outrigger, as well as properties on Sandtoft Road, it was difficult to view the location of the proposed dormer. While I recognise that parts of the dormer may be visible over and around the outrigger this would only be in glimpses. Further, it would be viewed in the context of other dormer windows and so while it may be more readily legible from neighbouring properties, it would not affect the appreciation of the surrounding area's character.
7. Although the proposal may not comply with the 0.5m gap guidance set out within the SPD, it would not be an overly dominant addition. As noted above, its siting is largely screened from public views, and its position is somewhat retiring. Its width and general scale would not, therefore, be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building. I am also mindful that Figure i.29 of the SPD presents a dormer that similarly fills a roof slope but is deemed to be acceptable by the guidance. Given the above, I find that the proposal would comply with the SPD's general aims to protect the character and appearance of buildings and their surroundings.
8. The proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or its surroundings and, as such, would comply with Policy D3 of The London Plan and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies. These collectively, and amongst other matters, require developments to regard and respond to the local character and urban context, and to be of a high-quality design. Particular regard is had by policy DH(a) to rooves and that any roof extensions must respect the scale and character of the host building, street scene and its surroundings. The proposal would also comply with the guidance contained within the SPD.

Conditions

9. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council and the advice on planning conditions set out by the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In the interests of clarity and enforceability, I have made some changes to the wording.
10. For certainty, I have set out the timescale for the commencement of development. A condition is also necessary, for certainty and enforceability, requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. A further condition is required securing external materials that match the host building to protect character and appearance.

Conclusion

11. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Samuel Watson

INSPECTOR