



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2021 by Ms S Maur

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3280412

Site Address: 22 Mauritius Road Greenwich SE10 0EQ

- 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 Matthew Jones against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 21/1697/HD, dated 9 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a loft conversion incorporating a rear dormer, 2 rooflights to front roof slope, and replacement roof tiles.
-

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 surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a mid-terrace two storey dwelling with a pitched gable roof, situated to the north of Mauritius Road. The dwelling is set within a residential area that consists of two-storey terrace dwellings with a broadly consistent design and traditional fenestration, which are key characteristics of the terrace. There is new build flatted development nearby and modern three storey properties within a private gated development to the rear of the host dwelling.
5. The proposal includes a loft conversion incorporating a rear dormer which would lift the ridge line, remove the eaves, and cover the full width of the rear roof slope. Two roof lights on the front roof slope would also be provided.
6. The Royal Borough of Greenwich, Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD) states roof extensions should be proportionate to the size of the original house and should seek to preserve or enhance the existing appearance in terms of scale and visual interest. It also states that full width dormer extensions will be discouraged on any roof face, 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 conflict with the advice set out in the SPD.

7. The height of the proposed ridge would sit below the party wall parapets, however the raise in the ridgeline, where there is a broadly consistent level between the neighbours, would undermine the characteristic consistency. The full width nature of the dormer and the loss of the eaves would subsume the rear roof and undermine the character of the roofscape. The use of matching materials would not mitigate the harm.
8. The large, angled, window would be at odds with the modestly sized and traditional character of the fenestration in the appeal dwelling and its attached neighbours. From the observations on the site visit, the example of a similarly shaped window provided by the appellant did not appear to be representative of the fenestration generally found in the area, and so this does not justify the proposal.
9. The views of the development would be from private land which includes the private (gated) access road to the development to the rear. Although this road is not publicly accessible, the rear of the development would be seen from this access road and a number of nearby properties. The harm to the dwelling and terrace would be visible. In any event, the raised ridge line would be observed from the front. This would therefore not mitigate against the harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.
10. My attention has been drawn to modern development with a square box form. While this is close to the appeal site, the context of the appeal property is the terrace it sits in, which has a broadly consistent design. Examples of other box dormers in the wider area have also been provided. However, none of these are seen in the immediate context of this appeal site or directly comparable in terms of form and scale. Therefore, these would not mitigate or justify the appeal development.
11. The appellant has indicated that an alternative 'L' shaped dormer window scheme could be permitted development. That scheme is likely to have different characteristics compared to the appeal development, such as in respect of ridge height and the impact on the eaves. The appellant suggests that a raise in ridge height is necessary to achieve the minimum height within the dormer, and so it is not clear that the alternative could meet this limitation. In any event, even if it were constructed, it is likely to have characteristics that do not have the same impact. Therefore, I give this matter limited weight and it does not outweigh the harm identified.
12. For the reasons detailed above, the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal would not be compliant with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan, Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014. Together these seek to respond to the existing character of a place by taking account of the architecture of the surrounding buildings, the scale, height and massing of the adjacent townscape and for all new roof extensions to be designed to respect the scale and character of the host building, the street scene and the surrounding area.

13. The proposal would also not comply with Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021) which states that development proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings that positively responds to local distinctiveness through their scale and appearance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. 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

15. 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