



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3240585

48 Brooklands Park, Blackheath SE3 9BL

- 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 K. Maddison against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/2738/HD, dated 2 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2019.
 - The proposed development was originally described as "single storey side and rear extension with infill extension at first floor rear and new rear bay. Alterations to enlarge the roof to the rear with new rear dormer. New entrance canopy, bin store and replacement windows".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for construction of single storey side extension with part 1/part 2-storey rear extension, installation of an additional rear dormer window, first floor rear bay window, new porch canopy together with new bin store, replacement windows and associated external works at 48 Brooklands Park, Blackheath, SE3 9BL, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/2738/HD, dated 2 August 2019, 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 approved plans: 423.S10(A), 423.S01(A), 423.S02(A), 423.S03(A), 423.S04(A), 423.P01(D), 423.P02(D), 423.P03(D) and 423.P04(D).

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The description of the proposed development set out within the above banner heading has been taken from the application form. However, for clarity and precision, the description of the proposed development set out within the above decision has been taken from the decision notice and appeal form.
-

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, which includes the Blackheath Park Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey detached property on the western side of Brooklands Park, near the junction with Brookway. The surrounding area is characterised by similar properties. During my site visit, I saw a large, ground-floor rear extension to No. 42 to the north that had a distinctive modern design using materials that contrasted with those of the host building. I also observed that Nos. 42 and 44 featured front doors that had a contemporary appearance. The site is situated within the Blackheath Park Conservation Area, whose significance is largely derived from the quality and diversity of its housing.
6. Alterations to the rear comprise a ground floor rear extension, first floor bay window, alterations to the existing dormer and an additional dormer. The use of large-scale glazing, timber cladding and zinc around the glazing and dormers would represent a departure from the original brick and render materiality of the host building. However, the use of such materials would be appropriate as part of the overall scheme which, like other rear extensions in the surrounding area such as that at No. 42, would provide a contemporary juxtaposition to the form and appearance of the appeal property in an appropriately sensitive manner. Furthermore, the form of the development, including the asymmetrical design of the proposed fenestration at first-floor level, would reflect the modern aesthetic of the overall proposal and as such would be acceptable.
7. The neighbouring properties at Nos. 42-50 vary from one another in terms of their design and rear fenestration, and so there would be no loss of any discernible visual rhythm across the rear of this row of houses and the proposal would not appear harmfully incongruous. Also, as the rear extensions and fenestration alterations would be discreetly located away from public views, their effect on the wider Blackheath Park Conservation Area would be minimal.
8. Nos. 42 and 44 to the north feature contemporary front doors with frosted glass. As such, the proposed front door would not have an overtly incongruous appearance when considered as part of the immediate streetscene and would therefore be acceptable. Similarly, the proposed replacement windows on the front elevation would feature glazing bars comparable to those of the existing windows, and so this part of the proposal is also acceptable.
9. Though not raised as a concern by the planning officer, the Council's conservation officer asserts that the proposed extensions would appear excessive in terms of their scale and massing. However, I consider that the proposed ground-floor side extension and part-one/part-two storey rear extension would each respond positively to the proportions of the original dwellinghouse and would therefore appear as subservient additions. Also, the proposed rear dormers would have a symmetrical and balanced appearance within a coherent, consolidated roof form and would not appear excessively sized. The proposed side extension would only be single storey so there would be no visual terracing effect and, though it abuts the boundary, its gutter is behind a parapet wall hence negating the need to maintain a gap for

maintenance. I also agree with the planning officer that due to the small scale and harmonious materials of the bin store and porch canopy, no material impact on the character and appearance of the Blackheath Park Conservation Area would result.

10. Overall, it is considered that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property, surrounding area and the Blackheath Park Conservation Area, whose significance would be preserved. The proposal therefore complies with Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), Policies DH1, DH3, DH(a) and DH(h) of the Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions SPD (2018) and the Blackheath Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2013), which all require that development should be designed to a high standard, have regard to the character of the area, contribute to a coherent streetscape and preserve the significance of heritage assets such as Conservation Areas.

Conditions

11. The conditions which are imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the proposal shall be built in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR