
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2017

by L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA

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

Decision date: 14 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/17/3172274
44 Kidbrooke Park Road, London, SE3 0DU

- 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 Paul Morrison against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 16/3912/F, dated 24 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion comprising side and rear dormer windows.
-

Preliminary Matter

1. The description of development was altered between the application form and appeal form. I have taken the description of the development from the appeal form because it more accurately describes the proposal before me.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, No. 44 Kidbrooke Park Road, is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling set back from the road behind a fairly large front garden area. A lane provides rear access along the side of the property. The property has a steep hipped roof and an attractive chimney stack which adds visual interest. The surrounding area has a varied character; a number of other very similar semi-detached pairs sit alongside larger three-storey dwellings and flats.
 5. The proposal would provide additional accommodation in the loft space of the property which would be facilitated through the introduction of large side and rear dormers which would wrap around the property. The proposal, particularly the side dormer, would be readily visible from the surrounding area.
 6. The proposed extension would represent a large addition and would cover an excessive proportion of the existing roof area. Consequently, the proposal would be of a disproportionate scale and would appear bulky and dominant. The side
-

dormer would be set-back only minimally from the eaves of the existing roof which would add to the lack of visual subservience to the host dwelling.

7. Furthermore, the interruption to the roof would detract from, and unbalance, the symmetry of the semi-detached pair. I, therefore, conclude that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair and the wider area.
8. I acknowledge the architectural variety in the area and noted a number of other dormer extensions in the vicinity of the appeal site; including on the other pairs of similar semi-detached properties. However, each case must be treated on its own merits and the other extensions differ in design terms from the current proposal. Furthermore, the pair of which No. 44 is part is currently unaltered and the symmetry of the roof remains intact. In any event, I am not aware of the details surrounding those other extensions and the existence of other examples does not justify perpetuating the harm I have identified.
9. I recognise the appellant's intentions to create an attractive and sympathetic extension and I note that, in theory, a similar extension could be built under permitted development (PD) rights. However, the extension that could be built as PD would be smaller than the current proposal and I have no reason to believe that the appellant would not take the same care over the design as per the current proposal. In my view, any extension of this nature would, therefore, be less harmful.
10. The proposal would, therefore, fail to accord with the aims of policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy (CS), adopted July 2014. Amongst other things these policies require all developments to be of a high design quality and to provide a positive relationship between the proposed and existing urban context. Policy DH(a) specifically expects roof extensions to respect the scale and character of the host building, street scene and surrounding area.
11. The proposal would also be at odds with the aims of policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, March 2016 which requires development to provide a high quality design response which complements the local architectural character.
12. The proposal would also fail to meet the aims of guidance contained within the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which requires extensions to be in keeping with the size of the original house. The SPD specifically states that if dormer extensions are proposed on both side and rear roof slopes they must remain separate and not wrap around to create one extension.
13. Having regard to my conclusions on the main issue and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J O'Brien

APPOINTED PERSON