

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2021

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3276422

148 Charlton Lane, Charlton SE7 8AB

- 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 Annabel Raftery against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/0774/HD, dated 2 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is roof extension with two rear dormers and two front roof lights (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof extension with two rear dormers and two front roof lights (retrospective) at 148 Charlton Lane, Charlton SE7 8AB. The permission is granted in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/0774/HD, dated 2 March 2021.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the roof extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey mid-terrace dwelling in a residential road of similar property types on the same side of Charlton Lane and more modern properties opposite and to the rear.
 4. Policy DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy and Detailed Policies (2014) (CSDP) requires a high quality of design in new development, while Policy DH(a) includes the requirement that residential extensions should be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality. Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021) requires development to take into consideration the form, function and structure of an area and the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings.
 5. The *Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance* Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides guidance to support these development plan policies. It says that roof extensions should be proportionate
-

to the size of the original house and that dormer extensions should be small scale, avoiding box dormers as they can be overbearing.

6. The roof extension as built comprises a flat-roofed box dormer across the whole rear roof slope and a structure of similar proportions and appearance that covers around two-thirds of the depth of the rear perpendicular projection from the main part of the dwelling. The height and extent of these additions, with no inset from the eaves, sides or roof ridge dominates and obscures the original roof form. As such, the extension harmfully alters the proportions and appearance of the original dwelling, giving it a top heavy appearance. For these reasons, it is contrary to the guidance in the SPD for this type of extension.
7. These changes are not visible to the front of the property, but are readily seen from the public realm and neighbouring properties to the rear along Lansdowne Mews and William Close. The extent of similar alterations to the roofscape of other properties along the terrace is also apparent from these views. In particular, the majority of visible neighbouring properties have similar forms of dormer extension. As such, the extent of these changes has materially altered the original character and appearance of the rear of the terrace as a whole.
8. I acknowledge the Council's contention that many of these were built as permitted development or are undocumented and most are not as extensive as the changes to No 148, as they have some degree of inset from the eaves and sides of the roofs. However, given the overall extent of changes to the roofscape of the terrace, the visible differences between the dormer at No 148 and those on neighbouring properties are limited. Indeed, the extension to No 148H, directly next to Lansdowne Mews, is more visually prominent than the alterations to the appeal property.
9. For these reasons, any harmful effects to the individual property as described are overcome by the extension's setting, which reflects similar changes across a substantive number of properties. Consequently, the roof extension is not an uncharacteristic or otherwise incongruous feature both in terms of its effects on the terrace and the appeal property. Therefore, I conclude that the roof extension does not have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. As such, there is no conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan or with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the CSDP, particularly as these policies require consideration of the effects of development in relation to a building's locality and surroundings, as well as on the individual building.

Conditions

10. The Council suggests three standard conditions, concerning commencement, compliance with plans and matching materials. However, as the development has been undertaken these are unnecessary.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR