

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 29 September 2020 by Sarah Witherley CIHCM MRPTI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/20/3252038

Flat 2, 9 Gallosion Road, Plumstead, SE18 1RD

- 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 N S Jandu against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 20/0305/F, dated 22 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is Construction of a loft conversion with rear dormer & front two sky windows.
-

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 rear dormer on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an upper floor flat located in a two-storey terraced property. At the rear, the property has an existing two storey outrigger which covers part of the rear elevation. The character along this part of the rear terrace row appears relatively unaltered and the original roof form remains intact.
5. The proposed box dormer would be constructed almost up to the existing ridge line and out across its full width up to the party walls. As a result of the box like design along with its height and form, it would dominate the existing roof scape of the appeal property and those of its adjoining neighbours rather than sitting within it and appearing as a subservient addition. As such, it fails to integrate well with the existing roof plane as required by the Residential Extensions, Basement and Conversions Guidance (2018) (SPD).
6. Given its location, intervisibility of the rear roof profile from street view or the public realm is limited, however, the harm I have identified to the appeal building would also, to a limited degree, harm the wider character and appearance of the terrace row as a whole. The scheme therefore conflicts with

the requirements of both Policies DH1 and DH1(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan and Policy 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan that require, amongst other matters, that developments respect the character of the site and its surroundings and that they positively contribute to the improvement of the built environment.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has submitted a number of examples of similar rear dormer extensions where they consider a precedent has occurred including reference to previous appeals where the Inspector has allowed the appeal. I have reviewed each of these separately and consider that the site circumstances are all different to those that are before me. For example, the appeal in Shooters Hill related to a semi-detached property of different proportions and street context and the proposed dormer also appeared to be set down and in from the existing ridge line and side boundaries. The development at Old Mill Road related to an end of terrace property in a location that I am not familiar with therefore cannot be certain that any of its characteristics are the same as the appeal site. I have not been provided with either of the Inspector's appeal decisions and it has not been demonstrated that there are any clear comparisons with the sites, their respective proposals and the appeal before me.
8. The development at Hector Street related to a rear dormer that was offset from a shared boundary which is not comparable with the proposal before me. The proposal in Eglinton Hill is not comparable given the hipped roof and form of the dormer. The proposal in Conway Road appears to relate to a first-floor rear extension and is not considered comparable with the appeal before me.
9. Reference has also been made to a previous Inspector's decision at the appeal site which dismissed an appeal for the construction of a 'rear dormer and outrigger extension and the installation of two front rooflights'. The plans relating to that scheme have not been provided but it was clearly a substantially different scheme. The Inspector's decision letter refers to an L-shaped roof alteration covering nearly all of the main roof and the roof of the outrigger. The Inspector made no comment on anything but the scheme that was before him and there is nothing within that decision that leads me to alter my recommendation in this case.
10. The above reference to other examples does not lead me to alter my recommendation and I am unable to give significant weight to the issue of precedent.

Conclusion

11. 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

Inspectors Decision

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

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR