



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2019 by S Witherley BA, PGDiP, PGDiP, Cert CIH, Assoc RTPi

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3230667

21 Dickson Road, Eltham, London, SE9 6RE

- 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 Ireneusz Marciniak against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application, Ref 19/0317/HD, dated 29 January 2019, was refused by notice 26 March 2019.
 - The development proposed as described on the application form is: proposed loft conversion with conservation style roof lights to rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Progress Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No. 21 is located within an area defined by its arts and crafts themed architecture and low-density housing. The appeal property is a mid-terrace dwelling with its rear roof profile being a standard pitched roof with shared chimney stacks at either end. Whilst there were roof lights installed throughout the wider CA, it was apparent that these were limited in the area surrounding the appeal site. As such, they do not form part of the character of this part of the CA.
 5. The rear roof profile of No. 21 can be seen from various viewpoints along Sandby Green and given the quantity, scale and siting of the roof lights they would be a notable intrusion in the otherwise uninterrupted roof profile and at odds with the architectural features of the original building. Despite being flush with the roof and having a central glazing bar, the roof lights would draw the eye unduly as a result of their lack of integration within the original design and would, therefore, present as a dominate feature which would detract from the overall character and appearance of both the appeal building and the
-

surrounding CA. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with the principles and guidance contained in the *Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance*, Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (SPD).

6. Notwithstanding that the development would be located to the rear of the property and the level of harm caused is considered less than substantial it is, nevertheless, to be given considerable importance and weight. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. No evidence has been submitted to show any public benefits. The proposal, therefore, causes harm that is not justified or outweighed, as required by the Framework.
7. Previous planning permissions for similar developments throughout the CA have been referred to. However, these are differently located and positioned and are not comparable to the development submitted. These other developments are not strong enough reasons to allow visually harmful development and, in any event, each application is considered on its own merits. Lack of objections do not outweigh the material harm which has been identified.
8. I find that the development would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host building and fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Accordingly, the development would fail to comply with Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), and Policies DH1, DH3, DH(a) and DH(h) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan, Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).

Conclusion and recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, it is recommended that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR