



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3308974

51 Wrotesley Road, Plumstead, Greenwich SE18 3EW

- 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 Ms B Glusica against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/1776/HD, dated 25 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a first floor rear extension, loft conversion with a rear dormer window with Juliet balcony and 2 rooflights, outrigger dormer, 3 rooflights to front roof slope, new enlarged window with Juliet balcony at first floor level. Re-installment of the pitched roof over the existing front bay window and alterations to rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice, as this is a full and accurate description that has also been used by the appellant for their statement.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and that of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey palisaded terraced house with a two storey outrigger with a single storey flat roofed extension to the rear of this, which projects into the good sized rear garden. It is located on the edge of an area of similar terraced streets, which faces onto a mid-20th Century planned estate of low rise flats that line the majority of the other side of the street.
5. The proposed rear flat roofed dormer extension would replace the whole of the existing rear roof slope of the main house and would also replace approximately half of the roof slope of the existing outrigger. There would be a slight step down between the proposed main roof and outrigger dormer extensions. The rear dormer would be zinc clad with windows to the rear of

- both parts. The proposed window to the rear of the main roof dormer would include a Juliet balcony detail. A further Juliet balcony detail is proposed for the existing rear window at first floor level of the main house.
6. The proposed first floor extension would sit above the whole of the existing extension to the rear of the outrigger, and would extend the existing pitched outrigger roof. Whilst on its own, this part of the proposal would appear as a subservient addition to the appeal property, it would form part of a more significant set of proposed rear roof level alterations and extensions.
 7. When considered as a whole, the proposed rear and dormer extensions would substantially increase the scale of the existing house. This increase in scale would be fundamentally at roof level, where the size and square roofed massing of the proposed rear dormers would result in significant roof level bulk when considered against the existing roofs of the appeal property and that of its neighbours.
 8. Due to this poorly designed massing, the excessive bulk of the proposal would be readily apparent in rear views from surrounding gardens, from where the proposed rear dormer extensions would appear as top heavy, incongruous and unduly prominent box like additions to the appeal property that would dominate its appearance. This would stand in contrast to the roof forms and scale of the properties that make up its neighbours and the wider area. In this regard the proposal would fail to reflect the established character of the area, which in this part, especially to the rear of the appeal property, is defined by its relatively unaltered or extended pitched roofed traditional terraced houses.
 9. The proposed reinstatement of a pitched roof above the front ground floor bay window and the 3 rooflights proposed for the front roof of the main house, would however appear as subservient and complementary additions to the appeal dwelling. Lack of harm in this context is a neutral factor in my considerations.
 10. Whilst the appellant has drawn my attention to other rear dormer extension in the wider area, these would have been considered on their own merits. I have done likewise with my consideration of the proposal, which is a main tenet of the planning system.
 11. The appellant has also set out that there is the potential for a rear dormer extension to the main rear roof slope of the appeal property under the provisions of the GPDO.¹ Whilst it would appear that this is a realistic fallback position for the appellant, such an extension would not involve a dormer to the existing outrigger or result in the same bulk and box like massing as the proposal. As such, an extension under the provisions of the GPDO would be significantly smaller than the proposal and would have a materially different effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and that of the local area that I have identified above.
 12. For the reasons given above I find that the proposal, when considered as a whole, would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and to that of the local area. This would not accord with the design guidance for such development set out in the Royal Borough of

¹ The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development etc.) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)

Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) and is contrary to policy DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraphs 130 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions, demonstrate high quality design, respond to site context and integrate with the local area.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR