



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 08 November 2021 by Ms S Maur

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3279862

Site Address: 35 Cleanthus Road, Plumstead SE18 3DF

- 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 Serban Razvan (Luxury Rooms Express LTD) against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 21/1414/HD, dated 15 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of the roof to create a hip to gable, rear dormer and a front dormer/ roof light to create additional rooms in the roof space and first-floor infill.
-

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 development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with a hipped roof and front and distinctive rear gable, with chimneys on each side. The dwelling is located at the southern end of Cleanthus Road. There are prominent views of the rear and side of the dwelling from the park, which is located to the side and rear of the property. Hipped roofs and front gables are an established characteristic of this residential area close to the appeal site. This roof form minimises the bulk at roof level.
5. The proposal consists of a first-floor infill extension, enclosing the Juliet balcony to the rear, a hip to gable roof, a full-length rear dormer with minimal step back and step down and two rooflights to the front roof slope. The Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance 2018 (SPD), states that proposals that change the roof form should seek to preserve or enhance the existing appearance in terms of height, scale and visual interest.
6. The proposed rear dormer would be very large in scale and it would not be set up from the eaves from any significant degree. It would cover almost the

entirety of the width of the roof slope as extended. This would result in a very top-heavy appearance and would appear contrary to the design of the other dwellings in this part of the street. In respect of dormer extensions, the proposal would be in conflict with the SPD, which advises that these should be small scale and that box dormers should be avoided as they can be overbearing.

7. The proposed hip to gable roof extension would appear as bulky and dominating to the host dwelling and would not be sympathetic to the established hipped roof form in the immediate area. This would be exacerbated by the prominent location, where the roof alterations would diminish the reprieve at roof level, when viewed from both the street and the park. The infill extension and dormer would largely subsume the rear projecting gable feature and the existing chimneys would be removed. Collectively this would result in the rear of the dwelling appearing monolithic.
8. In relation to the windows and balcony proposed within the rear dormer, these would be unsympathetic in design and arrangement to the fenestration on the existing house and surrounding area.
9. Although the host dwelling is the last one located on this side of the road, before the park, the proposal would still significantly effect the street scene as this location is encompassed within it and therefore the proposed development would cause harm. Even though the proposed materials would match the existing dwelling, this would not minimise the harm identified above. This is therefore neutral in this case.
10. For the reasons detailed above, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal would not comply with Policies D3 of The London Plan (2021) and DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) which together seek that development should be a high-quality design that responds to the existing character and is limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality, including in respect of roof extensions.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR