



Appeal Decision

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

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3239591

23 Hardy Road, Blackheath SE3 7NS

- 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 Patricia Fitton against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/2575/HD, dated 18 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2019.
 - The proposed development was originally described as "demolition of the existing single-storey side extensions; construction of replacement part 1/part 2 storey side extensions; side extensions of the existing front porch on both sides and extending the gable roof over; construction of first floor rear extension above existing single storey element and installation of two Juliet balconies, with internal re-planning throughout the property".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing garage and side extension to allow the construction of two x part one/part two storey side extensions, demolition of existing porch and construction of a two storey front extension, construction of a first floor rear extension, installation of replacement window to front elevation and other external alterations at 23 Hardy Road, Blackheath SE3 7NS, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/2575/HD, dated 18 July 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 1065/01, 1065/10 Rev E, 1065/11, 1065/12 Rev B and HR/TPP/1562-03.

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.

4. In the delegated report, the Council state that they would have required the appellant to provide proposed roof plans had they been inclined to approve the proposal. However, I do not consider that such plans are necessary as I have been able to fully appreciate and determine the proposal based on the drawings submitted.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve the character or appearance of the appeal property and Westcombe Park Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, detached dwellinghouse on the eastern side of Hardy Road which is sited within a substantial plot. The appeal property features a distinctive catslide roof form at the front. The appeal property also features a single-storey side extension and an attached garage along its northern and southern boundaries respectively. During my site visit, I observed that properties along the eastern side of Hardy Road have been subject to a variety of large rear extensions at ground and first floor levels. The streetscene is characterised by large buildings built in a variety of architectural styles, with Edwardian and Victorian detached, semi-detached and terraced properties standing alongside more contemporary dwellinghouses and blocks of flats. The site is situated within the Westcombe Park Conservation Area, whose significance is largely derived from the richness and design complexity of its houses and the green vistas apparent between them.
7. While the proposal would result in the enlargement of the appeal property, the resultant property would be of a similar scale to properties in the immediate vicinity and would be of an appropriate size for its plot. The proposal would retain a catslide roof form at the front, thereby preserving a key characteristic of the existing property's design. Seen within the context of the streetscene, where there is significant variety between individual properties, the proposed front extension would not appear unacceptably incongruous or obtrusive.
8. The first-floor side additions would retain sufficient gaps from the neighbouring properties so that trees and vegetation to the rear would still be visible from the street and, alongside the ground-floor side additions, would introduce a greater symmetry to the property's appearance. Given their scale, height, and set back from the front elevation and side boundaries, the proposed first floor side extensions would have a suitably subordinate appearance to the host property. Furthermore, as both additions would retain distances of around 3.5m and 2m from Nos. 21 and 25 at first-floor level respectively, the proposal would not result in any terracing effect.
9. Although the first-floor rear extension would have a significant width atop the existing ground-floor rear extension, this would be acceptable given the size and variety of first and ground floor rear extensions of nearby properties and its discreet location at the rear of the appeal property. As each of the additions at first-floor level would be set below the height of the principal roof ridge, they would therefore have a clearly subservient relationship to the original proportions

- of the appeal property. In light of these considerations, the proposal would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the site, surrounding area and Westcombe Park Conservation Area, whose significance would be preserved.
10. While the proposal would alter the front fenestration of the appeal property at first-floor level and result in the loss of the original porch, the character of the original building would be sufficiently preserved through the retention of the distinctive catslide roof form. In consideration of the overall proposal, the loss of these original features would be acceptable.
 11. Although there would be some changes to the roof profile, the principal roof ridge and chimney stacks would be retained. As such, the proposal would therefore preserve the proportions of the original roof form to an acceptable extent.
 12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the appeal property and Westcombe Park Conservation Area. The proposal therefore complies with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), which require that development should have regard to the form of an area, be designed to the highest standard and be appropriate to the building and locality, Policy 7.8 of the London Plan and Policy DH(h) of the Core Strategy with Detailed Policies which state that development should protect and enhance heritage assets such as Conservation Areas, and the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018), which states that residential extensions should be sensitive to the original building and respect the character of an area.
 13. The proposal would also comply with Chapters 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), which state that development proposals should be of a high quality and sympathetic to local character, and that great weight should be given to the impact of a proposed development upon the significance of a designated heritage asset.
 14. The reason for refusal cites conflict with Policy DH(b) of the Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014). As this policy relates to the effect of development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, rather than matters of heritage or design, it is not relevant to the main issue of this appeal and nor would there be conflict with it.

Conditions

15. 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 with materials matching the external surfaces of the existing building in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.
16. Additionally, for the avoidance of doubt, I have imposed a condition requiring that the proposal is built in accordance with the approved plans. In their delegated report, officers state that they would have attached a condition relating to tree protection if they had been inclined to grant permission. However, given the level of detail contained within the tree protection plan, I

am satisfied that adequate tree protection would be provided in accordance with this plan.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. 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

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR