

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 May 2017

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP Dist. MRTPI

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/17/3171581
44 Bellot Street, Greenwich, London SE10 0AH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Andrew Rogers against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 16/3454/F, dated 19 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion and extension at second floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Viewed as a whole, the existing development on Bellot Street has a mixed form and character. However, the appeal site is located towards its northern end and comprises part of a late Victorian two storey short terrace with pitched roofs at the front. There is a similar terrace on the opposite side of the road. Consistency in the ridge heights appears to have been maintained and the uniformity of the properties in this regard is a visually pleasing and important part of the character and appearance of the locality.
4. At the rear, the properties have two storey outriggers with shallow pitched roofs that terminate in a hipped form. At roof level, the outriggers of the appeal terrace and those of the properties immediately to the north on Azof Street have largely been unaltered.
5. The proposed development would see the top of the front roof slope extended and the ridge height increased. Notwithstanding the modest proportions of these changes they would be sufficient to undermine the existing uniformity in the ridge heights and harm an important part of the character and appearance of the locality.
6. At the rear of the property, the proposal would involve a flat roof dormer that would wrap around the main part of the house to where the hipped element of the outrigger commences. It would be set back a small degree from the eaves and the parapet wall to the outrigger would be raised.

7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance' 2016 (SPD) specifies dormer extensions should be small scale. The appellant considers the dormer on the outrigger would be that. However, it would be inappropriate to consider the outrigger element in isolation when it forms part of a larger wrap around dormer. In the context of the whole rear roof, the majority of which it would cover, the dormer could not be regarded as small scale and would conflict with the SPD.
8. The extent and bulk of the dormer would lead to the rear of the property having an uncomfortable top heavy appearance. The addition would be over-dominant and unsympathetic to the existing character of the house. The change to a predominantly flat roof form and the raised parapet wall would also appear incongruous amongst the largely unaltered roofscape of the site's immediate surroundings.
9. The appellant draws attention to a similar recent development at No 23 Azof Street. However, that development is not directly comparable because the associated Certificate of Lawful Development was seemingly predicated on the ridge height not being raised, (Council Ref: 15/3940/CP). As a consequence, it fell within the limitations of permitted development and did not require an application for planning permission. It was therefore not considered against planning policy, as must apply in this case.
10. The development at No 23 is sufficiently distant from the appeal site so as not to act as an influential design cue for roof extensions at the appeal terrace. The same may be also said of 100 Annandale Road where the ridge heights are inconsistent due to the land rising. In any event, the principle to be followed in decision making is that each case should be considered on its own merits. Other developments in the wider area do not provide justification for a scheme which is found to be harmful in its own right.
11. The benefit of providing additional living space at a family home does not outweigh the identified harm. It is also noted the proposal represents a modified scheme from one previously refused by the Council. However, it is apparent from the findings above that the changes made are insufficient to make the revised scheme acceptable.
12. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The development would conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) as well as Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Council's Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).
13. Amongst other things, the policies require residential roof extensions to be designed to respect the scale and character of the host building, the street scene and the surrounding area. The development would further conflict with the Council's SPD which specifies that all new residential extensions should be sensitive to the original building and respect the street scene.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C J Ford APPOINTED PERSON