



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2019

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3234971
2A Brookway, Blackheath SE3 9BJ

- 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 Winton against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 19/1306/HD, dated 8 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a double storey front/side extension, re-configuration of the roof construction with roof lights and a modest dormer construction at the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a double storey front/side extension, re-configuration of the roof construction with roof lights and a modest dormer construction at the rear at 2A Brookway, Blackheath SE3 9BJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/1306/HD, dated 8 April 2019, subject to the conditions set out below;
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan Ref S00; Block Plan Ref S002; Existing Drawings Ref S1; Existing Drawings ref S2; Existing Drawings S3; Existing Drawings S4; Existing Drawings S5; Proposed Drawings P1; Proposed Drawings P2; Proposed Drawings P3; Proposed Drawings P4; and Proposed Drawings P5.
 - 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.
 - 4) No development shall commence until a scheme for both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of the following:
 - Hard surfacing, other hard landscape features and materials;
 - Existing trees, hedges or other soft features to be retained and measures for their protection throughout the course of development;
 - Proposed planting, and
 - An implementation programme.

The landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development in the banner heading above from the application form. Although different to that on the decision notice and the appeal form, no details have been provided to indicate any change was agreed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Blackheath Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within the CA. As such I have had regard to the duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character or appearance. For the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), the CA is a designated heritage asset.
5. From my observations, and the Blackheath Park Conservation Area Appraisal (appraisal), I consider that the significance of the CA lies, in part, in its verdant and spacious streets with properties set back from the road behind landscaping within the verge and the plots themselves. There is diversity to housing types and designs of the built form vary across the CA. However, there are often common characteristics within individual streets and rows of properties. Brookway includes two detached and semidetached houses with bay windows and hipped roofs. The appeal site currently reflects this and contributes positively to the significance of the CA.
6. The proposal would remove the existing step in the front elevation of the appeal property. Nonetheless, the SPD¹ states that where the front of the house is staggered in an L shape a small front extension may be possible. While properties frequently have a staggered building line along Brookway, the depth of the projection and the L shaped hipped roof profiles are generally more pronounced on semi-detached properties. Moreover, although having a mansard roof at first floor level, there are also detached properties without a projection from the main roof in Brookway and in nearby streets. Furthermore, the retention of the bay window would aid in breaking up the front elevation of the appeal property.
7. The proposed single hipped roof would be bulkier than the present one. Nevertheless, while often at semi-detached dwellings, there is larger built form and roofs in the street. There are also detached properties in the same street and surrounding ones that have a large single hipped roof.
8. The proposal would use matching materials and the additional footprint would be modest. The overall height of the building would not increase, and the roof

¹ Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance

extension would not come further forward than the existing roof. Therefore, the resultant front elevation and roof would not appear uncharacteristic to, or jar with, the nearby streetscene.

9. The SPD states that dormer extensions can be acceptable to the rear of houses. While not well away from the ridge, the dormer would be below it, above the eaves and set in from the side boundaries of the roof. The flat roof would be in contrast to the pitched main roof at the appeal property. Nonetheless, there are several examples of dormer windows visible along Brookway and the surrounding streets. There is no uniformity to their scale and appearance, and they include box shaped dormers. Therefore, the proposed dormer would not be discordant with the existing altered rear roofscape in the area.
10. The windows in the dormer would have a vertical emphasis to their glazing as do the existing openings below. Moreover, the proposed glazing would reflect the proportions of the wide and tall ground floor openings at the house at present.
11. There are existing rooflights at the appeal property and further examples of them at other dwellings nearby. Therefore, as the Council did, I find these would be acceptable.
12. Consequently, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It would comply with Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan, Policies DH1, DH3, DH(a) and DH(h) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, the SPD, the appraisal and the Framework. These, in part, aim to ensure development positively contributes to the built environment, protecting and enhancing heritage assets.

Other Matters

13. Local residents have concerns over the impact of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring properties including from overlooking and loss of light. The appeal property is set in from the boundaries of the plot. There is sufficient separation distance between the appeal site and other dwellings to prevent any unacceptable impacts in regard to privacy and light. Moreover, there are existing first floor windows and rooflights that are orientated towards other properties.
14. I have considered the scheme on its own merits and found it to be acceptable on the basis of the particular circumstances of this development. Therefore, I can see no reason why it would lead to harmful developments on other sites.
15. Issues relating to any potential enforcement action, previous works at the site and compliance with conditions are a matter for the Council away from this appeal.

Conditions

16. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the requirements of the national Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework. Where necessary and in the interests of clarity and precision I have altered the conditions to better reflect the relevant guidance.

17. In addition, to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty.
18. Additionally, I have imposed a condition to ensure that external materials should match the existing property in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. For the same reason a landscape condition is imposed. It is necessary to agree these details prior to the commencement of the development as they include protecting existing features during construction.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, and having taken all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions above.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR