The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2023 by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3302480
51 Berryhill, London SE9 1QW

- 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 Mrs Leanne Parry against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
- The application Ref 22/0957/HD, dated 17 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2022.
- The development proposed is described as a two storey side extension loft extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. There are inconsistencies in the description of development. Given the absence of any agreement between parties to amend the description of development, I have used that within the application form in the banner heading above. In any case, it adequately identifies the development subject of the appeal.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The area surrounding the appeal site is primarily characterised by pairs of two storey semi-detached dwellings. Whilst the original roof form of most of these pairs is hipped, many have undergone alteration and extension to the side roof slope resulting in the erosion of this feature and loss of symmetry between the pairs. There are examples of two-storey side extensions within the area, however these appear limited to those dwellings with larger open areas adjoining the side elevation. A number of dwellings within the vicinity of the appeal site have undergone alterations to their rear roof slopes in the form of box style dormers. Despite their scale, the dormers appear subservient to, and retain the understated quality of, their host dwelling through their simplicity and being confined to the rear roof slope.

6. The appeal property forms the end of a terrace of three dwellings, with its adjoining garage adjacent to large open garden areas. Whilst there is some variation in the design of the dwellings forming the terrace, there is a consistency in the hipped roof design of the end buildings, contributing positively to a sense of continuity in the street scene. The rear of the appeal property appears unaltered excluding a small box dormer contained within the roof slope, maintaining its original simple form and that of the wider terrace.

7. The proposed side extension would create a new element to the rear roof slope that would interrupt its present structure. The proposed dormer would extend beyond the existing rear roof slope and across the side extension. The rear roof configuration of the side extension combined with the box dormer intersecting it would result in a convoluted roof structure jarring unacceptably with the existing and represent poor design. This would sit at odds with the more understated rear roof elevations of properties within the area and particularly that of the terrace, appearing intrusive and incongruous.

8. Whilst the side extension would slightly elongate the host dwelling, the front elevation would retain the characterful hipped roof form of the terrace. The large extent of open area adjacent to the appeal site would enable the proposal to retain the pleasant spacious character of this area. The Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (2018) states that extensions should normally be set back slightly from the front wall of the house to allow the original house to remain prominent. Although the front elevation of the proposed side extension would not be recessed from that of the original dwelling, there would be a clear stepdown in ridge height which would adequately articulate the separation from the host property in addition to achieving subservience to it. There is thus justification to depart from the guidance in this case.

9. When taken as a whole however, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. Thus, it would 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 (2014) which collectively require new development to be of high quality design and positively contribute to the local character.

Other Matters

10. Appeal decision APP/E5330/D/18/3211497 is within the vicinity of the proposal, albeit not close enough to provide a local context. The development comprised a loft conversion, roof extension, and enlarged front porch, sharing some similarities with this appeal. A Certificate of Lawfulness for a roof extension established a fallback position which factored heavily in the Inspector's determination of appeal APP/E5330/D/18/3211497. Given the absence of any such fallback position, I do not consider this appeal analogous. In any event, the presence of the above appeal does not justify the harm I have found.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no other material considerations in the evidence which would be

of sufficient weight to indicate to the contrary. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis I dismiss the appeal.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR