



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2022

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9TH May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3294274

72 Bastion Road, Abbey Wood, London SE2 0RG

- 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 Joseph Bartlett-Vanderpuye against the decision of the Council of the Royal London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref: 21/4474/HD, dated 15 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is infill erection of single storey rear extension along with erection of first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No.72 Bastion Road is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling. It has an existing single storey side extension with a flat roof and is located in a residential area. The terrace is relatively short with the two end dwellings having similar original roof forms.
4. The proposed first floor side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the building by around 0.76 m. Like the single storey extension, it would have a flat roof. There is a single storey extension with a flat roof at the other end of the terrace. However, the proposed flat roof at first floor level would appear discordant in relation to the form of the building and would be prominent and out of character in the street scene. It would conflict with advice in the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance supplementary planning document, which indicates that the roof of a side extension should reflect the roof pitch of the original house.
5. The proposed roof dormer would have minimal set back from the eaves of the house and ridge line. It would also be close to the party wall with the adjoining building. This would also be contrary to the Council's guidance which indicates that dormer extensions should be small scale and box dormers should be avoided as they can be overbearing. However, I note that two other properties in the short terrace have large flat-roofed rear dormers. Nevertheless, the

single storey rear extension would add to the amount of proposed development, and I agree with the Council that cumulatively the development would fail to appear subordinate to the host property.

6. I find that the proposal would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and the street scene. It would therefore conflict with policy D3 of the London Plan regarding a design led approach. It would also conflict with policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, and with the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance supplementary planning document and the need for residential extensions to respect the scale and character of the host building, the street scene and surrounding area.
7. The appellant has referred to other roof alterations at Nos. 117 and 125 Bastion Road. However, these do not involve first floor flat roof forms and their existence is insufficient reason to justify allowing the appeal before me.

Conclusion

8. I acknowledge that the appellant wishes to increase the overall living space of this family dwellinghouse and that sufficient garden space would be retained. However, I have found above that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. It would therefore not constitute a sustainable form of development, or represent high quality design, contrary to the objectives within the National Planning Policy Framework. I have taken all other matters raised into account but conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR