



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2021
by C Rafferty LLB (Hons), Solicitor

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3270080

113 Domonic Drive, Eltham SE9 3LQ

- 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 Kevin Whelehan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 20/3571/HD, dated 19 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with hip to gable and rear dormer with front velux roof lights.
-

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 main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Procedural Matters

4. The Council's decision notice refers to Policies the London Plan (2016). These policies have now been superseded. Appeals must be determined in accordance with the policies in force at the time the decision is made. The policies of the London Plan (2021) have therefore been used in this recommendation. Parties were given the opportunity to comment on the updated position and these comments have been considered.
5. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. The comments which have been received have been considered in my assessment of this case.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling in a residential area with a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension. Immediately surrounding properties on this side of the street primarily consist of similar semi-detached dwellings. These share a level of consistency in style and design, albeit various extensions and alterations are visible from the street.
7. The proposal would remove the hipped roof element of the main dwelling, creating a gable end. This would significantly alter the roofline and would sit awkwardly alongside the hipped roof element of the pre-existing side extension. The roof is already stepped in nature and this addition would create a complex roof form when taken as a whole, that would not respect the character of the property and would result in a cramped frontage. It would also be contrary to the SPD¹ which, although guidance rather than policy, remains a material consideration and does not support hip to gable conversions on the side of the house.
8. The dormer element of the proposal would also introduce extensive additional bulk. While set within the roof it would nonetheless span across a substantial proportion of it, causing significant alteration to the roofline. It would be a dominant feature that would not be proportionate to the overall scale of the dwelling, resulting in an uncharacteristic top heavy appearance.
9. Overall, the proposal would result in a form of property that would appear awkward and contrived. While the dormer would not be visible from Domonic Drive, from the rear it would be viewed alongside the front elevation alterations, which would stretch taller and wider. This combination of elements would overwhelm the roofscape, resulting in a varied roof form that would appear visually jarring. It would significantly change the character, scale and form of the dwelling. In this sense it would not preserve or enhance the existing appearance of the property in line with the SPD.
10. It is acknowledged that the front facades in the street are varied, with other examples of gable conversions and rear dormers in the nearby vicinity. Irrespective of whether these have been constructed under permitted development rights, they are nonetheless features of the surrounding area that should be considered in assessing the character. However, each case is dealt with on its own site specific circumstances and it is the particular combination of the proposed dormer and gable conversion elements on an already extended dwelling that causes an unacceptable level of harm, even when taking surrounding development into account.
11. For the reasons given above I find that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such, it would fail to accord with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021); Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and the SPD, which together seek to promote good design.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has stated that the proposal could be constructed under permitted development rights. However, I have been provided with limited information on the nature of the permitted development (PD) rights or the

¹ Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (2018)

likelihood of these alterations being built, and therefore there is no evidence of a realistic fallback position. In addition, from the plans submitted it appears that the scheme built under PD would differ from the proposal in removing an additional hipped roof element. Limited weight is therefore attached to this argument.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

C Rafferty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR