



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: 17th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3347231

2 Poplar Place, Greenwich, Thamesmead SE28 8BB

- 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 Victor Majumder against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/0424/HD.
 - The development proposed is roof alterations including raising of the ridge height to facilitate loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof alterations including raising of the ridge height to facilitate loft conversion at 2 Poplar Place, Greenwich, Thamesmead SE28 8BB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/0424/HD, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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, 2PP-PL-02, 2PP-PL-03, 2PP-PL-04, 2PP-PL-05, 2PP-PL-06, 2PP-PL-07, 2PP-PL-08, 2PP-PL-09, 2PP-PL-10
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a large group of terraced dwellings that share a palette of materials and design cues but read as almost an informal and ad hoc arrangement. The roofscape in the area contributes to this informal appearance by way of the orientation, scale and height of the individual rooves. While predominantly the rooves run along the terraces there are examples of rooves that project higher on one side or sit perpendicular to the rest of the terrace.
4. The appeal dwelling sits at the end of, and perpendicular to, a terrace and projects forward of it towards the carriageway. The roof is also perpendicular to the rest of the roofline and the gable fronts onto the carriageway. While both slopes of this roof and the majority of the roof along this terrace are equal in proportions, the dwelling at the other end of the terrace is served by a taller roof. This is formed of

a long slope on one side that stretches down to the top of the first floor and a shorted slope on the other that reaches down to the top of the second floor. During my site visit I noted a number of similar examples within this estate.

5. The proposal would increase the height of the roof to accommodate an additional floor. This would be achieved by raising the height of the ridgeline and raising the eaves on the rear elevation to the top of the second floor. I find that this arrangement would be very similar to that at the other end of the terrace, as well as elsewhere in the estate. Although I note the proposal would extend above the ridgeline of the adjoining properties, I am mindful that this is not uncommon within the area and would reflect the property at the other end of the terrace. In all therefore, I find that the proposal respects the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
6. Whilst I recognise that there is only one example of a dormer extension within the estate, the proposal does not comprise a dormer and so I consider that this is not determinative in my considerations. Although the proposed plans do not include details of the external materials to be used, the application form confirms they would match the existing and this could be controlled by condition.
7. In light of the above, the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or its surroundings. The proposal would, therefore, 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 which 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 Royal Borough Greenwich Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. In particular with regard to the section on Adding Extra Floors.

Conditions

8. 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.
9. 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. In order to protect the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings a condition is required to ensure the external materials match those of the host dwelling.

Conclusion

10. 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