



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2019

by S A Whitehead LLB (Hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3228233 38 Burwash Road, Plumstead SE18 7QZ

- 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 Bickley against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 18/4015/F, dated 16 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a dormer roof extension including outrigger and installation of two rooflights to the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. I have used the description of the proposed development from the application form although I note that it is expressed differently in other documents.
3. I have used the address provided on the application form although I note that it is expressed differently on the appeal form.
4. I have had regard to the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued in February 2019 in reaching my decision. In respect of the main issue, the revised NPPF has not changed national policy. Consequently, no party has been prejudiced by the revision.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and wider terrace of which it forms part.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two storey mid-terrace Victorian dwelling house, with a two storey outrigger to the rear. The outrigger adjoins the outrigger of the neighbouring property, No. 36, and the pair of outriggers share a gabled roof. The other properties in the terrace are of a similar design, with similar mirrored pairs of outriggers. During my site inspection, I noted the presence of two other roof extensions in the terrace. However, apart from these few exceptions, the terrace still exhibits a well preserved and unaltered roofscape.
 7. The proposed extension would occupy nearly all of the main rear roof slope of the property and slightly less than half of the roof slope of the outrigger.
-

- Rather than appearing as an incidental element within the roof, by reason of its scale and design, the extension would constitute an obtrusive and incongruous addition that would make the host property appear top heavy. It would also significantly alter the size and shape of the existing roof, giving the perception of a taller building with a flat roof. Due to the fact that the roof extension would straddle both the property's main roof and its outrigger, it would also render the original roof form of the host property illegible.
8. Overall, I find that the proposal would result in an ungainly, disproportionate and dominant addition that would fail to respect the architectural character and scale of the host property and the terrace of properties in which it is situated.
 9. The appellant has submitted plans relating to loft conversions at Nos. 42 and 39 Burwash Road. These show loft conversions of a similar design to that proposed. I was only able to partially view the loft conversion at No. 42 by standing in the garden of the appeal property. I afford these examples limited weight as roof extensions do not appear to me to be characteristic of the terrace in which the appeal property is situated. Moreover, these examples which, the appellant advises, did not require planning permission, do not justify further development that conflicts with the policies and guidance currently in force. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and found that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
 10. I find that the proposed rear dormer and outrigger extension by reason of its design, scale, bulk and massing would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and the wider terrace. It would therefore be contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2016 which require new development to be of high quality design and make a positive contribution to the character of the area. Furthermore, it would fail to comply with policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 in terms of its design and failure to respect the established architecture of the host property and surrounding buildings.
 11. The proposal would also conflict with the guidance contained in the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2016). This guidance advises that roof extensions should be proportionate to the size of the original house and should preserve or enhance its existing appearance in terms of height, scale and visual interest. It would also be contrary to the guidance contained in Chapter 12 of the NPPF in terms of its design and harmful effect upon the character of the area.
 12. I have had regard to the appellant's Design and Access Statement, the desire to provide extra living accommodation, and the presence of other properties in the area that have been extended. However, none of these factors alter my decision.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sandra Whitehead

INSPECTOR