
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2020

by Baljit K Muston BA(Hons) PGDip MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3249859
119 Crescent Road, London SE18 7AH

- 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 Kanti Chhabhadiya against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/3674/HD, dated 23 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2020.
 - The development is the construction of a first floor rear extension with a flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The application form described the proposal as "*Retrospective planning application for flat roof*". The Council changed this description to "*Construction of a first floor rear extension with a flat roof (retrospective)*". This more accurately describes the proposal, as it is an alternative proposal for development already permitted under permission 18/3198/HD, rather than solely for the flat roof. I have therefore used this description, whilst omitting the word "*retrospective*", as the proposed development has been commenced but not fully completed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. No 119 is towards the north-eastern end of a long terrace of properties fronting Crescent Road. Bloomfield Road runs to the east of the appeal site, and the first floor and roof of the appeal property and its neighbours are clearly visible from the pavement on its eastern side. From here, the rhythm of the first floor rear extensions to the properties to the south-west of the appeal site is apparent, with Nos 109-117 all having extensions that project approximately the same amount as that proposed at No 119, and all with dual-pitched roofs sloping away on each side from a central ridge. To the north-east of the appeal site, Nos 121-123 include what appears to be an original two storey projection at the rear. This is also dual-pitched, although twice as wide as the extensions to the south-west of the appeal site.

5. The permission granted for an extension at the appeal site (Ref 18/3198/HD) would have replicated the approach at Nos 109-117 and resulted in a development in keeping with its surroundings.
6. The appeal scheme is for an extension of the same footprint as previously permitted, but with a flat, rather than a dual-pitched, roof. The roof of the extension the subject of this appeal is lower than the ridge of the approved scheme, but higher than the eaves. It was clear from my site visit that the raised eaves and flat roof have made the first floor extension appear at odds with its neighbours on either side and unduly prominent when seen from Bloomfield Road. Whilst the approved scheme (unlike the appeal proposal) would have involved the ridge of the extension's roof breaching the eaves line of the main house, this would be much less harmful to the character and appearance of the area than the appeal proposal.
7. As the appellant points out, the rear elevation of the appeal property is seen in the context of the buildings on the corner of Crescent and Bloomfield Roads (125-127 Crescent Road). These include a substantial flat-roofed two storey extension fronting Bloomfield Road. However, because of the appeal site's location in the terrace, its impact on the street scene is more influenced by its immediate neighbours than by the buildings at Nos 125-127.
8. The appellant also states that the appeal site "*sits in the middle of a cluttered rear streetscape, part of a row of densely packed terraced houses with a mishmash of rear extensions and other alterations*". However, because of the height of the boundary treatment along the western side of Bloomfield Road, it is only the first floors and roofs of the terrace that are prominent in the street scene, and many of the extensions and alterations referred to by the appellant are at ground floor level.
9. I noted on my site visit that a large flat-roofed dormer window has been erected on the rear roof slope of No 115. I have no evidence before me as to whether this required, or has received, planning permission. In any event, although prominent in the street scene, it does not interrupt the rhythm of the first floor extensions at the rear of the terrace in the way that the appeal scheme does.
10. Policy DH1 of the adopted Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) (CS) requires proposals to have a high quality of design and to be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality. Policy DH(a) of the CS specifically relates to residential extensions and states that flat roofs will not be accepted on side or rear extensions when they would be visible from the public highway. This policy position is replicated in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (2016) (SPD). The appeal proposal is contrary to these policies.
11. The appellant argues that a development will comply with the intentions of Policy DH(a) where it is not especially visible from the street or does not cause material harm to the street scene. In my opinion, the prominence of the appeal proposal from parts of Bloomfield Road does cause material harm to the street scene and is clearly visible from Bloomfield Road. The proposal is contrary to this policy, and the guidance in the SPD.

12. I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the CS.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Baljit K Muston

INSPECTOR