



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022 by C Glaister BSc (Hons)

Decision by A McCormack BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3291811

63 Tunnel Avenue, Greenwich SE10 0SF

- 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 Mrs Nicoletta Trovisi against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/3397/HD, dated 19 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as "Rooms in the roof conversion with rear dormer".
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. The Council have not raised concern with respect to the rooflights. The rooflights are minor alterations that would not cause harm, and the recommendation will therefore focus on the rear dormer.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The site is an end-of-terrace property. It has a pitched roof, and gabled elements at the front and back. The terrace is largely symmetrical, and none of the properties along it have roof extensions. The rear of the roof, where the proposal would be sited, is visible from Chilver Street. The rear of the site is otherwise obscured from public views by the buildings along Fingal Street. There is a rear dormer on a property on Tunnel Avenue, further east of the appeal site. It is associated with a larger gable projection and does not cross the ridge of the gable.
6. The dormer proposed would cross the ridge of the rear gable. It would have a flat roof and its windows would be misaligned with those below. It would disrupt the rear roofscape of the terrace and weaken its symmetry. For these

reasons, and with particular regard to the dormer's size, position, and design, it would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the terrace as a whole, and harm would arise.

7. The Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (December 2018) (SPD) suggests that roof extensions should be proportionate to the size of the original house, and that dormer extensions should be small scale and the windows should be of an appropriate design considering the other windows in the house. The proposal would not align with the guidance provided in the SPD.
8. The rear roof extensions on the properties on Fingal Street tend only to be associated with the main roof. Given the longer length of the terrace on Fingal Street, its core symmetry is not immediately obvious, and the dormers do not cross the ridge of a roof. Whilst most dormers on Fingal Street are full-width, and in some instances present on successive properties, they are not directly comparable to the appeal site and proposal for the reasons provided above. The appeal is considered with respect to its own individual merits. The dormers in the vicinity of the site are materially different and do not in any case justify or mitigate the harm that has been identified. Whether or not it is possible to achieve a better design for the proposal, it remains unacceptably harmful. Improving the lives of the owners is a personal benefit with limited weight which would not outweigh the harm that would arise.
9. For these reasons, the rear dormer would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the surrounding area. It would therefore fail to comply with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) which together seek to ensure: development achieves a high quality of design; proposals for rear additions are limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality; and development responds to the existing character of a place. It would also fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and its aim to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Glaister

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

A McCormack

INSPECTOR