



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 December 2020

by Alex Hutson MRTPI CMLI MArborA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/20/3260189
436 Westhorne Avenue, Eltham SE9 5LT

- 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 Rashid Hammou against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 20/2138/HD, dated 11 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is loft extension with rear hip to gable and two side dormer extensions with front roof light.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. The appellant's appeal form identifies the name of the local planning authority as the London Borough of Bromley. However, the correct local planning authority is the Royal Borough of Greenwich.

Main issue

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

Reasons

4. Westhorne Avenue runs alongside the A205 and typically comprises detached or semi-detached dwellings along one side. These tend to be of a similar architectural style and to display hipped roofs. This affords a uniform quality to the street scene and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. The appeal property, which has been extended to the side and rear in the past, is a two-storey detached dwelling with a hipped roof. It thus complements the character and appearance of the street scene and area.
5. The proposal seeks to extend the loft of the appeal property by constructing two flat roofed side dormers and a rear hip to gable extension. A rooflight would be inserted into the front roof slope.
6. The Council raises no concerns over the proposed front rooflight and I am satisfied that this element would be an appropriate addition. However, the proposed roof extensions, given their considerable size, scale and design, would overtly dominate the roof of the appeal property, giving it a top-heavy

and unbalanced appearance. Moreover, they would appear at substantial odds with the architectural style of the appeal property and the general uniform quality of the street scene. As such, the proposal would be an incongruous addition to the appeal property that would give rise to marked harm to the character and appearance of the area.

7. The appellant makes reference to some other roof extensions, including at the adjacent property No 434 and at No 426. A photograph labelled as No 434 has also been provided, though from my observations this appears to show No 422. However, I am informed that the roof extensions at Nos 434 and 426 were constructed under permitted development rights, which, as I understand it, the appeal property does not benefit from for the type of development proposed. With regard to No 422, I am uncertain of the planning status of this roof extension. In any event, the roof extensions at these three properties, which include large flat roof side dormers on their hipped roof slopes, are not typical of dwellings along Westthorne Road and appear at odds with the architectural styles of the host dwellings and the prevailing pattern of development in the locality. Accordingly, these examples do not justify a planning permission.
8. In light of the above, the proposal would be contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014. These policies require, amongst other things, development to be of a high quality design, to complement local architectural character, to make a positive contribution to the streetscape and, in respect of roof extensions, to respect the scale and character of the host building.
9. The proposal would also be contrary to the guidance of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD). The SPD advises that residential extensions should be sensitive to the original building and should respect the street scene and character of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alex Hutson

INSPECTOR