



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2023

by J Wellstead BA(Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3309522

20 Rennets Wood Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 2ND

- 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 Ibrahim Oruc against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/1922/HD, dated 8 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is a garage conversion to habitable room, erection of part single and part two storey side and rear extension and loft conversion with 1No rear dormer and 2No roof light at front roof together with roof alteration from hip end to gable end.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Planning permission was granted for the demolition of the existing garage and construction of a part single and part two storey side and rear extension (reference 21/2384/HD0. However, a number of other alterations to the property have taken place and this application seeks to regularise the complete development.
3. The appellant suggests that the other alterations may have been granted planning permission in accordance with planning permission granted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GPDO). It is not for me, under a section 78 appeal, to determine whether or not that development would benefit from the planning permission granted by the GPDO.
4. The application forms describe the development as retrospective. However, that is not a description of development, so I have removed it from the description set out above. I was able to view the completed development when I visited and have taken this into account in coming to my decision.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling in a residential area which predominantly comprises pairs of similar dwellings with hipped roofs.

- There is a strong architectural pattern in the street scene as a result, with minor variations where extensions and alterations have been made.
7. The scheme's conversion of the hipped roof to gable end has introduced an incongruous roof form into this section of the street scene, resulting in an unbalanced appearance to the pair of semi-detached dwellings.
 8. The rear dormer occupies almost the full width of the rear roof. It is inset to different degrees on each side of the roof, and with fenestration that is out of alignment with the windows beneath. This has resulted in a design which looks odd and incongruous due to its position, and which dominates the roof due to its scale.
 9. The addition of the hip end to gable end roof form and large rear dormer, in combination with the approved works, has cumulatively resulted in extensive alteration work that dominates the scale and form of the original dwelling.
 10. The schemes at No. 34, 41 and 42 Rennets Wood Road are in a different section of the street, where there is more variation in roof form. The scheme at No.15 is of a slightly different design with a smaller and less prominent gable end, so is not comparable to the appeal scheme. In addition, although other similar examples of developments may have been constructed in accordance with the planning permission granted by the General Permitted Development Order, I have limited information on the circumstances of those other developments being granted planning permission.
 11. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the local area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan, the Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (2021) and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014). These policies seek to ensure - amongst other matters - that new development is of high quality, responds positively to local distinctiveness and is of an appropriate scale for the host building and established pattern of development. It also conflicts with the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (July 2016), which seeks to ensure that extensions remain subservient to the original dwelling and do not create an unbalanced or overbearing appearance.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

J Wellstead

INSPECTOR