

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2016

by Jason Whitfield BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21st December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/16/3154052

132 Basevi Way, Greenwich, Deptford SE8 3JT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Daniela Innocente against Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 16/0905/F, is dated 21 March 2016
 - The development proposed is rear dormer loft conversion and front velux windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear dormer loft conversion and front velux windows at 132 Basevi Way, Greenwich, Deptford SE8 3JT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/0905/F, dated 21 March 2016, 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: 132/01A, 132/02A, Block Plan and Location Plan.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

2. Whilst the appeal is made against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission, the Council has provided an officer committee report which sets out its objections.
3. Therefore, on the evidence before me, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, terraced house. It is one of five properties on a terrace all of which have similar brickwork and roof profiles. It adjoins an 'L' shaped block of flats which varies between three and four storey in height. The appeal site and the terrace are somewhat uniform in appearance with hipped roof designs that reflect the wider, planned residential development.
-

5. The Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance SPD 2016 (SPD) states that dormer windows will be discouraged on front roof slopes and, in all cases, should not exceed the ridge of the house. It further states that dormers should be small and of similar design to other windows in the house. Full width dormer extensions will be discouraged on any roof face.
6. I note the terraced roofscape along this part of Basevi Way is largely free of built form and that there are no other dormer windows on the other properties. Nevertheless, the proposed dormer window would be to the rear and set in from both sides of the roof with a width of around 4.4m. It would not extend the full width of the property. It would also be set back from the eaves with a projection of 3.6m and would be set below the ridge of the main roof with a height of 2.2m. Furthermore, the design of the windows within the dormer would reflect those of the existing property. Consequently, the dormer would remain subservient to the existing property and would not, in my view, fail to harmonise with the terraced properties on this part of Basevi Way.
7. In addition, views of the dormer would be limited to the communal garden of the adjacent flats and the neighbouring gardens on Basevi Way, with only restricted views from the residential gardens to the rear. Views of the dormer window from within the public realm would be significantly limited. Moreover, the dormer window would broadly reflect, in its scale and massing, the second floor of the adjacent flats. Visually, it would be read in that context and would not, in my view, create a prominent addition to the property. As a result, the dormer window would not appear as an obtrusive, dominant or incongruous form of development.
8. The Council has raised no concerns with the proposed roof lights to the front of the property. On the evidence before me, I have no reason to come to an alternative conclusion.
9. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. To that end, it would accord with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan¹ which require high quality design. It would also comply with Policy DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 which state that development should be of a high quality design and that all new roof extensions should respect the scale and character of the host building and surrounding area. It would also accord with the guidance set out in the SPD.

Conditions

10. As well as the standard time limit condition, a condition relating to the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

Jason Whitfield

INSPECTOR

¹ The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011, 2016