

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2016

by Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/16/3156309

93 Ashridge Crescent, Plumstead, SE18 3EA

- 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 Michelle Jones against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 16/1474/F, dated 10 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing conservatory and side extension and erection of single storey rear and single storey side extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing conservatory and side extension and erection of single storey rear and single storey side extensions at 93 Ashridge Crescent, Plumstead, SE18 3EA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/1474/F, dated 10 May 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: DP/2768/PP/REV B/01, DP/2768/PP/REV B/0, DP/2768/PP/REV B/03 and DP/2768/PP/REV B/04.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Shrewsbury Park Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located within the Shrewsbury Park Estate Conservation Area (CA). The CA is an inter-war residential estate comprising detached and semi-detached dwellings that conform to a similar architectural theme. The properties are set within tree-lined streets that create an attractive, spacious suburban environment. The general uniformity of the design of the dwellings and their largely retained original features, such as their bay windows, make a positive contribution to the significance of the CA. During my site visit I observed that whilst the
-

frontages of the properties were largely unaltered, a number of properties in the vicinity of the appeal property had rear extensions, including the appeal property itself.

4. The existing ground floor bay window in the appeal property has been significantly altered. It is currently fitted with an aluminium framed patio door with full length aluminium framed side windows either side. The patio door opens up into a timber conservatory with a lean-to roof. The conservatory runs the full width of the rear elevation and fully encloses the bay window, preventing views of it from outside the conservatory. Given the presence of the existing conservatory, which appears to have been in situ for some time, and the unsympathetic alterations to the original bay window, any positive contribution the bay window had to the significance of the CA has already been lost. Furthermore, the unsympathetic design and materials of the existing conservatory currently detract from the character and appearance of the CA.
5. The proposal would be similar in size to the existing conservatory, with the only increase in footprint being a small extension of the utility to the side of the building. The extension would result in the removal of the existing conservatory and its replacement with a structure that is more sympathetic to the existing building and the area as a whole. Whilst what is left of the original bay window would be lost, as it no longer makes a positive contribution to the CA, the more sympathetic design of the proposal would outweigh this loss.
6. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. Paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) similarly requires account to be taken of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
7. This is reflected in Policies DH3 and DH(h) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (CS) 2014, which similarly state that development should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. Furthermore, Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the CS promote high quality design and proposals for rear additions should be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality.
8. The Council's Shrewsbury Park Estate Conservation Area Management Strategy (CAMS) 2013 states that the form and appearance of rear extensions should take account of the characteristics of the original house and maintain architectural unity. Furthermore, the CAMS also requires rear extensions to have a tiled, pitched roof. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would comply with the overall strategy of the CAMS.
9. I find therefore that whilst the development would not particularly enhance the character or appearance of the CA it would have a neutral effect and therefore preserve it. As such, it would comply with Policies DH1, DH3, DH(a) and DH(h) of the CS and the CAMS. Furthermore, it would also comply with the Shrewsbury Park Estate Conservation Area – Article 4 Direction Guidance Note and the Council's Planning Guidance for Home Extensions, which provide guidance on development within the CA and extensions to dwellings in general. In addition it would also accord with Policies 7.4 and 7.8 of the London Plan, which seek to ensure that development has regard to the form, function and

structure of an area, preserves or enhances the character or appearance of Conservation Areas and respects its context.

Conditions

10. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. For the avoidance of doubt it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area a condition regarding materials is necessary.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR