
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2017

by G D Jones BSc(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/17/3180994

11 Harrier Mews, Thamesmead SE28 0DQ

- 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 Mr Peter Whittingham against Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 16/2051/F, is dated 16 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Although it failed to determine the appeal planning application, the Council subsequently resolved that it would have refused planning permission had the appeal not been made. I have, therefore, determined the appeal on the basis of that decision and the associated putative refusal reason as corrected.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect that the proposed development would have on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, mid-terrace house located in a predominantly residential area. The terrace is reasonably typical of the surrounding pattern of development. It is a little unusual insofar as it backs on to a street located a short distance to the east, such that the rear roof planes of this row of houses are readily visible from the public domain. Although there are other examples of dormers / windows that project beyond the roof planes of houses in the vicinity, there are few that are comparable in scale and design to the appeal development such that they have a very limited influence on the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed rear dormer would be substantial in terms of its width, depth and height relative to the rear roof plane of the host house. Consequently, it would dominate the rear roof form and give the house a rather awkward, top-heavy appearance. The proposed hipped, pitched roof above the dormer is no doubt well-intentioned. However, in practice its pitch would be very much at odds with the angle of the roof of the host building, and would thereby draw further

attention to the incongruous nature of the development. Although the second-floor mass of the adjoining three-storey house would provide a partial screen to the proposed development, for the reasons described above, the dormer would, nonetheless, be highly visible when viewed from the nearby street to the east.

6. For all of the reasons outlined above, the proposed dormer window would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Consequently, in that regard, it would conflict with Policies 7.4 (Local Character) and 7.6 (Architecture) of the London Plan 2016, Policies DH1 (Design), Policy DH(a) (Residential Extensions) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy 2014 and the Residential Extensions, Conversions and Basements Supplementary Planning Document 2016.

Other Matters

7. I note the appellant's comments regarding the Council's conduct and the advice of its officers during the planning application process. However, these matters are not relevant to the determination of this appeal such that they have had no bearing on my decision.

Conclusion

8. For all of the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G D Jones

INSPECTOR