
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2024

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3339655

3 Mayhill Road, Charlton, London SE7 7JG

- 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 Luke Negal against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 23/3433/HD, dated 22 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a 2nd floor outrigger rear roof extension an existing dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter and main issue

2. While the appellant has described the proposal as in the above heading, which is taken from the application form, the Council has additionally referred to a Juliette balcony to the existing rear dormer. From my inspection of the plans, I consider that the Council's description more fully reflects the development sought. I have assessed the appeal scheme on that basis.
3. The Council raises no objection to new Juliette style balcony, which is in place. From the submitted evidence, I have no reason to disagree with that finding. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed dormer extension on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey mid-terrace dwelling of traditional style within a predominantly residential area. At the rear of No 3 is a 2-storey outrigger that is paired with the attached property to one side of the site, which is 5 Mayhill Road. Both of these outriggers include an outward projecting first floor bay facing the back garden and a mono-pitched roof with a ridgeline and eaves level set noticeably below that of the main roof. Unlike No 5, there is a dormer extension with a flat roof on the main rear roof slope of No 3. The site is not within a conservation area. The appeal dwelling is not a listed building.
5. A flat roof dormer extension is proposed on the roof slope of the existing outrigger with external materials to match those of the existing building. The new addition would connect with the existing dormer to form an 'L shaped' structure at roof level. In doing so, the proposal would introduce a third storey to the existing outrigger and extend over its entire length and most of its

width. The party wall along one side of the outrigger would also be extended upwards. As a result, the considerable scale and bulk of the appeal scheme and its elevated position would give the completed building an awkward top-heavy appearance.

6. By introducing a substantial new built form in a high-level position, the proposal would also unduly disrupt the subordinate relationship between the outrigger and the main house, which is an original design feature of the building even with the new extension set down from that of the existing dormer. Furthermore, it would upset the broadly symmetry between the outriggers of Nos 3 and 5 as a matching pair by unbalancing their rear elevations. That the new dormer would sit just above and so detract from the first-floor bay, which is a distinctive feature of the rear elevation, with a largely glazed rear elevation that would relate unsatisfactorily with the existing windows below, would visually accentuate its uneasy relationship with the host building. For all these reasons, the proposal would spoil the intrinsic character of the appeal dwelling.
7. As the new development would be at the back of the dwelling, it would not be evident from Mayhill Road. The new addition would nonetheless form part of the character of the local area as it is experienced and appreciated from nearby properties. From the back gardens of some nearby dwellings, the new dormer would draw the eye as an overly large and dominant structure. Consequently, the proposal would be an obtrusive and visually disruptive feature and an unwelcome addition to the local area.
8. The Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) contains advice in relation to roof level extensions. It states that such proposals should generally follow and complement the pattern and pitch of the main roof and be secondary in scale to the main roof, seeking to preserve or enhance the existing appearance in terms of height, scale, and visual interest. For the reasons given, the proposal fails to fully comply with this guidance. The SPD also advises that 'L' outrigger roof extensions will be refused as they can lead to the loss of the original roof pitch.
9. The appellant places some reliance on roof level extensions to other properties within a short walk of the site, with aerial photographs provided. With sizeable dormers visible from both the site and the road, I can understand the general impression these give, which is that the Council has been inconsistent or even unfair in allowing these developments and deciding to refuse planning permission in this case. However, few background details have been provided of these extensions and so I cannot be sure that their circumstances are the same or are very similar to those of the appeal scheme. The Council states that some existing extensions have come forward through the exercise of permitted development rights or they predate the latest policy guidance and so are not directly comparable with the proposal. In any event, a key planning principle is that each development should be assessed on its individual merits. Having done so, my own conclusion is that the proposed dormer would unduly compromise the form of the existing building and there would be a significant adverse impact on the surrounding area.
10. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposed dormer extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policy D3 of The

London Plan, Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies and the Council's SPD. Together, these policies and guidance require that all developments achieve a high quality of design by requiring that proposals for residential extensions are limited to a scale and design that is appropriate to the building and locality; and for all new roof extensions to respect the scale and character of the host building and the local area. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as it requires development to be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the local area.

11. In reaching this conclusion, I have carefully considered the appellant's personal statement. Once complete, the proposal would provide valuable additional living space to accommodate a larger family in the longer term and it would enable the appellant's mother to move into the enlarged property. I understand that neighbours' were consulted and expressed support for the extension and that attempts to discuss the proposal with the Council were unsuccessful. I have some sympathy for these circumstances. However, these matters do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations, including the policies of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
13. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, including the absence of objections from others, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR