



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2023

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3310829

27 Roydene Road, Plumstead, Greenwich SE18 1PZ

- 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 Jamie Sleep against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/2056/HD, dated 19 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2022.
 - The development is the proposed construction of a single storey rear extension and a loft conversion with rear dormer, outrigger dormer and 3 rooflights in the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. As the description of development varies between the documents submitted for the purposes of this appeal, I have used the description from the Council's decision notice as this concisely and accurately describes the proposal and has been used by the appellant in their statement.
3. The appeal relates to an application for planning permission for development, part of which has been implemented and part of which is proposed, therefore the application for the implemented part is retrospective, and I have determined the scheme accordingly.
4. Further, the appellant has indicated in their statement that they only wish to appeal that part of the council's decision related to that part of the proposal that has been implemented. The issues of the appeal do relate separately and distinctly to the implemented and proposed parts of the development that is the subject of this appeal, and these two parts are also distinctly physically separated. It would be procedurally possible to split the decision of this appeal as they relate to these two distinct parts of the development. However, given my consideration of the issues, as set out below, and my concomitant conclusions, I have not found it necessary to do so.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area, with reference to streetscene; and

- the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers, with reference to outlook and daylight.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal property is a traditional mid-terraced 2 storey palisaded house with a rear 2 storey outrigger. A relatively small rear garden slopes steeply upward away from the house. It is located on a street of similar properties, which make up the majority of housing in this primarily residential area. There is however evidence of post war reconstruction of WWII bombed terraces, including a short length of terraced houses that adjoin with the appeal property. To the rear of the appeal property is an extensive overgrown area of what appears to be land cleared of earlier development, possibly also related to WWII bomb damage.
7. At roof level, the appeal property has been the subject of a roof extension to facilitate a loft conversion that involves dormer extensions to both the rear roof slope of the main roof slope and the rear outrigger. The dormer extensions are to the full width of the main house and the outrigger accordingly. These dormer extensions share a flat roof that aligns with the roof ridge of the existing main roof of the appeal property. There are single window openings in the rear of both vertical tile hung dormer extensions. Although both dormer extensions align with the existing rear elevation, there is a small extended area of projecting tiled roof below them, which sits above the roof gutters of the appeal property.
8. The scale of the proposed roof extension, resulting from the width of the two dormer elements and their alignment with the rear wall of the house, results in a top heavy appearance to the appeal property. This, along with its single extensive flat roof and boxy design, results in it appearing as disproportionate and dominating, such that it unbalances the appearance of the appeal property in relation to the terrace of which it forms part. This is accentuated by the added projection of the rear roof slope, and is apparent in immediate views of the appeal property from the rear and gardens of neighbouring properties. For these reasons the roof level dormer extensions conflict with the design guidance given in the Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018).
9. Due to the local topography, there are extensive views from the elevated part of Sladedale Road to the rear of the terrace of which the appeal property forms part. Due to this elevated position and the openness of the land at the rear of the appeal property, the roof dormer extensions are prominent in views from this nearby street. This undue prominence results in the excessive scale and box form of the proposed dormer differentiating the appeal property from its neighbours. This results in the appeal property appearing as incongruous when viewed in concert with neighbouring houses and, therefore, detrimental to the streetscene.
10. The Council have raised no issues in relation to the proposed single storey extension to the rear of the property. From my site visit, it was apparent that due to its proposed scale and design, and location at the rear of the property, it would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property or that of the local area. I, therefore, see no reason to demur

from the Council's conclusion in this regard. In this instance, absence of harm is a neutral factor in my considerations.

11. The appellant has provided me with details of approved applications for Certificates of Lawful Development (CLD) for dormer roof extensions to other nearby houses. However, subsequent to the Council's refusal of planning permission, I note that a refusal of an application for a CLD for the box dormer extensions to the appeal property was also issued by the Council. The appellant has, however, set out that they believe that the implemented dormer extension development could be adjusted to accord with the national Permitted Development requirements. Whilst this could potentially form a fall back position for the appellant, I have considered the development on its own individual merits, which is a fundamental tenet of the planning system.
12. For these reasons, I find that, the development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and that of the local area. The proposal would not, therefore, accord with policies DH1 and DH(a) and DH(h) of Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014) (the Local Plan), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) (the London Plan) and sections 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework). These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions, demonstrate high quality design and integrate with the local area.

Living Conditions

13. The proposed single storey rear extension would be approximately 3.05 metres wide and would sit to the side of and align with the side of the existing rear outrigger and would have a flank wall that would run along the boundary of the appeal property with the rear garden of the neighbouring house at 29 Roydene Road (No.29). Whilst this would result in the proposal projecting approximately 2.7 metres from the rear wall of the outrigger, the flank wall of the proposal facing the garden of No.29 would be approximately 3.75 metres in length and approximately 2.905 metres in height.
14. The appellant has not provided me with any material that addresses this reason for refusal, however, from my site visit it was apparent that the extent of the flank wall of the proposal and its proximity to the ground floor window and glazed door of No.29 would lead to a significant sense of enclosure and loss of outlook and daylight to the ground floor rear room and rear garden area. This would be experienced by the occupiers of No.29 as oppressive, to a degree that would cause significant harm to their living conditions.
15. For these reasons, the proposal would fail to accord with policy DH(b) of the Local Plan, policy D3 and D6 the London Plan and paragraph 130(f) of the Framework. These collectively seek to ensure that developments provide appropriate outlook and sufficient daylight to surrounding housing and do not undermine the quality of life of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR