
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by P Wookey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3232882

3 Packmores Road, Eltham, SE9 2NB

- 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 Danny Moore against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 18/3852/F, dated 5 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as amendments to existing family home for more space Loft Extension, modification to roof to accommodate new living space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No 3 Packmores Road (No 3) is a semi-detached two storey dwelling with an existing two storey side and rear extension. The surrounding area is mainly residential with a uniform pattern of development with properties having similar architectural styles.
4. The development proposed would undertake a hip-to-gable roof extension and construction of a rear dormer with Juliette balcony. The roof extension would extend the original hipped roof to have a gable end set back approximately 1.2m from the end of the flat roofed two storey side extension. It would add approximately 6.5m in length to the length of the roof.
5. The Council's Residential Extensions, Basement and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD) states that roof extensions should be proportionate to the size of the original house. The development proposed would result in a significant addition to the existing roof, extending its length by approximately 6.5m. As a result of the additional bulk, it would extend over part of the existing two storey extension, leaving part of the flat roof visible. This would disrupt and significantly detract from the current proportions and scale of the host property.
6. The current roof form of No 3 and the attached property No 5 Packmores Road, has a degree of balance and symmetry, which would be severely affected by

the proposed roof extension to No 3 and the hip to gable design over part of the two storey flat roofed side extension, which would no longer appear to be subservient to the host dwelling. The increase and dis-proportionate scale of the proposed roof extension would unbalance the current roof form and the appearance of the semi-detached pair of dwellings. Further, proposed roof extension and gable end would be highly visible from the street level due to the separation distance with No 1 Packmores Road and would appear at odds with the host property and the surrounding area.

7. With regards the rear proposed dormer which would be approximately 7.2m wide, 3.3m high and 4.2m deep and which the Council states would extend the roof to approximately 8.9m wide, this would add considerable bulk to the host property. Given its scale and bulky appearance it would appear as a top heavy, incongruous addition to the sloping roof of the host property. Notwithstanding the Council has no concerns regarding the tiles, style and alignment of the fenestration of the proposed dormer, its grey rendered walls would make it appear as a second-floor extension rather than a minor and subservient addition to the roof.
8. Due to the overall design, bulk and proportions of the development proposed it would have a significant and harmful effect on the character and appearance of No 3 and the surrounding area. I conclude that the proposed roof extension and rear dormer would be contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and the guidance provided by the SPD, which when read together seek to ensure that all developments are required to be of a high quality design which would make a positive contribution to the built environment and residential extensions should be to a scale and design appropriate to the building and the locality.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has referred to other properties in the area having similar size loft extensions. Based on my site visit, whilst there was evidence of other properties in the immediate vicinity which had loft extensions, these were generally in proportion to the host dwellings. As these other schemes have no harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, they have not altered my decision.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Wookey

INSPECTOR