



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 April 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3315998

63 Domonic Drive, London SE9 3LN

- 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 and Mrs Croft against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/3504/HD, dated 21 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a loft conversion including formation of rear dormer and new rooflights to the front and side elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house. It is situated in a residential street comprising early 20th century semi-detached houses most of which feature hipped roofs and prominent double-storey bays at the front. Although some of the houses have been extended to the side, the street maintains a high degree of unity, which contributes positively to the area's character and appearance.
4. The appeal property includes a 2-storey side extension and an expanded roof form. The proposal would include the installation of a flat-roofed dormer within the rear roof-slope of the enlarged roof to enable the creation of a fifth and sixth bedroom, a WC and storage space. The portion of the southern side of Domonic Drive that the appeal property forms part of is notable for the complete absence of any dormers and dormers are not a particularly common or original feature on this style of house. The proposal would therefore be an entirely alien and incongruous element in this context that would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
5. For these reasons the proposal fails to accord with Policies DH(a) and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) which, among other matters, require a high quality of design, limited to a scale

and design appropriate to the locality. There is also conflict with the aims of Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and the guidance in the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018).

6. The proposal also includes the installation of rooflights in the front and side roof slopes. I am satisfied that these aspects of the proposal would accord with the aforementioned policies. However, the rooflights are not functionally severable from the overall scheme for the conversion of the roof space into accommodation. As such a split decision allowing the rooflights would not be appropriate in this instance.
7. The appellants refer to a number of hip-to-gable roof extensions and dormer additions on properties on the opposite side of the road, in the road to the rear and further afield. These generally demonstrate the harm to the appearance of the area than can result from such development. In any event the proposal must be considered on its individual merits having regard to its immediate setting, namely a group of houses without dormers.
8. I recognise the appellants' desire to have additional space for a growing family and for working from home. However, given the proposal would provide a fifth and sixth bedroom within a house that has already been extended to the side, it is not clear to me that the dormer is needed to meet the family needs described. The appellants' operate an Ofsted registered childminding business from the property which they advise provides childcare for six under 5 year olds every day of the week and requires the use of some of the bedrooms. Given the appeal property is a dwelling I afford limited weight to the appellants' business needs.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR