

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2017

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/17/3174332

85 Domonic Drive, Eltham, London, SE9 3LQ

- 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 Daniel Lawrence against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 17/0546/F, dated 15 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is an extended semi-detached hipped roof dwelling of pleasing appearance in an area of established residential character. The locality is suburban in nature with broadly similar detached and semi-detached homes, usually with hipped roofs, coming together to make an agreeable streetscene. The proposal is as described above and would provide increased ground floor living accommodation, a new bedroom and additional space at attic level.
 4. The two storey side extension would represent an unusual design. However I differ from the Council in that I consider that, in its own right, it would sit reasonably comfortably in aesthetic terms with the existing home, its adjoining home and its wider surrounds. Whilst usually one may wish to see the vertical element of side extensions set back from the main front elevation of the host property, in this instance the hipped gable and the bay window form are reflective of the host property would mitigate this and would represent a reasonable design solution. The planned gable being smaller than the main central bay and gable feature would help to keep the eye focussed on a reasonable central symmetry for the semi-detached dwellings.
 5. Regrettably the shape and scale of the planned roof alterations at the highest level would let the scheme down in my opinion. The strange and ungainly
-

combination and abutment of the hipped roof extension and the half gable, full ridge height, part of the scheme adding to the attic space would appear as contrived and alien in the streetscene. It would appear unduly awkward in visual terms, overly bulky, and lack the subtle element of good design which would be appropriate for this property and this locality.

6. Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (2015) and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) have relevance to the case. Taken together, and amongst other matters, they seek to ensure that development is of high quality design, sympathetic to its surroundings and integrating in the streetscene, suitable in form for its context, and protective of visual amenity. This is reflected in the advice and objectives of the Council's Residential Extensions, Conversions and Basements Supplementary Planning Document (July 2016) albeit that document cannot be expected to cover every eventuality. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the relevant development plan policies and the pertinent aims of the SPD.

Other matters

7. I sympathise with the wish of the Appellant to increase internal space to help meet family needs. I can see that there would be no harm to the residential amenity of neighbours and note that no objections have arisen. I appreciate that efforts have been made to seek to achieve a degree of subservience of form and that thought has been given to the amendment of a scheme previously refused permission by the Council (Ref 16/1765/F) and dismissed on appeal (Ref APP/E5330/D/16/3158384). I would agree that seeking total symmetry of semi-detached pairs is not always necessary and that there could well be scope for some flexibility in relation to the appeal property. I would agree with the previous Inspector that it is not the forward vertical element of the scheme that presents the visual problem it is the, now different, roof shape and form.
8. I recognise that there are other examples of side and roof extensions erected locally albeit I do not know the full planning background or timescale of these. I would conclude that some work successfully in visual terms, others less so. However for reasons of position, scale or form none are directly comparable to the appeal scheme which, in any event I must assess on its own merits.
9. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
10. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered and the development plan policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR