



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2025

by **P B Jarvis DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3352559

8 Brand Street, Greenwich SE10 8SR

- 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 Teresa Pierantozzi against the decision of The Council of the Royal London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/1585/HD.
 - The development proposed is construction of rear dormer extension and associated external works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of rear dormer and associated external works at 8 Brand Street, Greenwich SE10 8SR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/1585/HD, 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 accord with the following approved plans: T2403/0000 (site location plan), T2403/0001 (site plan), T2403/1000 (existing ground floor plan), T2403/1001 (existing first floor plan), T2403/1002 (existing loft plan), T2403/1003 (existing roof plan), T2403/2000 (existing section-00), T2403/3000 (existing front elevation), T2403/3001 (existing rear elevation), T2403/3002 (existing side elevation), T2403/1200 (proposed ground floor plan), T2403/1201 (proposed first floor plan), T2403/1202 (proposed loft plan), T2403/1203 (proposed roof plan), T2403/2200 (proposed section-00), T2403/3200 (proposed front elevation), T2403/3201 (proposed rear elevation), T2403/3202 (proposed side elevation) and T2403/3210 (proposed site elevation - side).
 - 3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. An updated version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. The relevant parts of the Framework have not materially changed and whilst the parties have not been asked to comment, I am satisfied they have not been prejudiced as a result.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area, including the West Greenwich Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey terraced dwelling of late Victorian / early Edwardian age with traditional bay windows to the front and rear two-storey outrigger. Dwellings within the immediate terrace are of similar age and appearance.
5. The Conservation Area Appraisal (2013) (CAA) states that West Greenwich is significant for the quality of its townscape and diversity of its architecture. The appeal site lies within a residential area of nineteenth and twentieth century origins within the central part of the conservation area between the main historic town centre and Greenwich High Road areas to the north and Blackheath to the south. The more modest Georgian terraces to the south of and opposite the appeal site are of a uniform appearance with 'flat' front facades with distinctive decorative brick arches over the small paned sash windows and front doors. According to the CAA these are locally listed.
6. There is a noticeably larger building of three stories with mansard roof addition on the corner of Brand Street and Circus Street opposite the site which appeared to be a vacant former public house. Dwellings in Circus Street are of similar age and style as that on the appeal site with one also displaying a 'mansard-style' roof addition which was visible within the street scene. Overall, the significance of this part of the Conservation area is derived from the, predominantly intact, architectural style and detailing of these residential properties.
7. The Council's Urban Design Guide SPD (2023) (UD SPD) states that loft conversions will generally only be accepted where adequate headroom is achieved without raising the ridge height and that they should be harmonious with the host building, be to the rear and complement the host dwelling, albeit simple contemporary designs that 'quietly contrast' but do not detract may be appropriate. Further guidance requires that they are well spaced and positioned within the existing roof slope.
8. The proposed dormer would be to the rear of the dwelling and thus not visible from within the street scene of Brand Street. There are some small gaps to the side of the nearby dwellings in Circus Street, but the rear of the dwelling cannot be seen due to the relative position of adjoining dwellings.
9. To the rear, the appeal site is part of a relatively intimate 'garden-scape' comprising of modest rear gardens and courtyards of the adjoining terraced properties and those to the west which front Greenwich Street. The proposed dormer would be sited on the main roofslope and whilst being higher than the adjacent rear outrigger, in views from adjoining rear gardens it would be screened to a great extent by it and by the rear outrigger of the adjoining property.
10. Only those dwellings immediately opposite to the rear would have clear view of the addition. Whilst it would extend across much of the width of the roof with only a slight set down from the ridge, it would be 'set in' from both sides and up from the eaves. The design displays a mixture of traditional and contemporary style, with a large extent of timber framed glazing, which whilst being of greater size, generally

reflect the appearance of those within the existing rear elevation of the host building, and set within external facings of slate roof tiles. Having regard to the character and form of the host building, this would represent a complementary addition which would not appear unduly dominant or intrusive.

11. The Council has referred to other nearby properties where dormer additions have been resisted including at appeal and, in particular, to a refused application at No 16 Brand Street which is a property of similar age and scale to the appeal site. However, the proposed additions in those cases were different in terms of their design and appearance. The circumstances are not therefore directly comparable.
12. Overall, the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or wider area. It would comply with Policies DH1, DH3 and DH(a) and (h) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy Detailed Policies (2014) and Policies D3 and HC1 of The London Plan (2021) which seek a design led, high quality approach that optimises the capacity of sites, compatible with site context, and that positively responds to local distinctiveness, and roof extensions that respect the scale and character of the host building and surrounding area and which preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area and conserve the significance of heritage assets.
13. Regard has been had to the duty under S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas) Act and I find that the character and appearance of the West Greenwich Conservation Area would be preserved. The proposal would also satisfy the policies of the Framework which seek to ensure that heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.
14. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council and agree that these should include one to relate to the approved plans in the interest of clarity and proper planning and one to require matching materials in the interest of the appearance of the host building and visual amenity of the wider area.

Conclusion

15. It is therefore concluded that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR