



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by Kate Mansell BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3232733

15 Tunnel Avenue, Greenwich SE10 0SF

- 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 Ghalia Arharbi against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 19/1337/HD, dated 9 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'loft conversion with rear dormer. Identical to No.23. Which I designed and was approved. No.23 Planning Ref: 14/0887/F.'
-

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 existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid-terraced pitched roof dwelling set within a predominantly residential street. The houses within the terrace are of a consistent design, being of relatively narrow proportions and each incorporating an outrigger projection to the back elevation. The appeal proposal would introduce a dormer window to the rear and two rooflights to the front roof slope.
4. The Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (Extensions SPD) (July 2016) states that dormer extensions are acceptable to the rear of a house as long as they are small scale and the windows are an appropriate design. However, it also advises that full width dormers will be discouraged on any roof face as they do not integrate well with pitched roof houses. It further illustrates that box shaped dormers can be overbearing.
5. In this case, whilst modestly set in from each side, the proposal would be box shaped and it would extend across nearly the entire span of the roof. Consequently, it would not constitute a small-scale dormer extension. It would be disproportionate in width and scale in relation to the host property and dominant as a result.
6. Furthermore, it would be visible from the public highway to the rear of the site. Even if matching materials were to be used in its construction, the dormer

would still occupy a substantial proportion of the rear roof slope. It would be prominent in views of the terrace from the wider streetscape and, therefore, an incongruous feature.

7. On my site visit, the only dormer that I could see from the rear of the site was that to No 23 Tunnel Avenue. I appreciate that from the appellant's perspective, the size and position of the rear dormer on the appeal property would be identical. However, the dormer to No 23 was approved in May 2014 and it predates the Council's Extensions SPD. Furthermore, its existence does not justify the further harm to the street scene that I consider would arise from the appeal proposal, particularly given the absence of any other rear dormers near to the appeal site.
8. With regard to the rooflights to the front of the house, the Council's decision notice indicates that they are not a matter of contention between the parties. Whilst they may not be functionally and physically severable from the rear dormer as part of a loft conversion, I find no reason to disagree that as a consequence of their small size, they would not be visually dominant. They would therefore be acceptable.
9. Nevertheless, for the reasons above, I conclude that the rear dormer would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (March 2016), Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy (July 2014). When read together, these policies, seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that residential extensions are appropriate to the building and locality and are of a high-quality design that contributes positively to the existing urban context and enhances the public realm. For the reasons cited above, it would further conflict with guidance within the Council's Extensions SPD.

Conclusion

10. For these reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Kate Mansell

INSPECTOR