



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 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: 31 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3242935

59 Shooters Hill, Plumstead SE18 3RL

- 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 W Virtue against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/2635/HD, dated 18 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 September 2019.
 - The proposed development is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 as included on the application form states "single storey rear extension and addition of rear dormer window to roof". However, no rear dormer is shown within the submitted drawings nor referenced within any of the submitted materials, nor is there any such mention within the description of the proposal as included within the appeal form or decision notice. As such, I have omitted mention of the rear dormer from the description of the proposed development as set out in the banner heading above and have considered this appeal solely on the basis of the proposed rear extension.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the setting of the Woolwich Common Conservation Area, and whether the setting of No. 57 Shooters Hill, a grade II listed building, would be preserved.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey, end-of-terrace property on the northern side of Shooters Hill. The host dwelling lies immediately to the east of No. 57, a detached grade II listed building whose significance is largely derived from its stucco rendering, deep eaves and distinctive arched windows. As No. 57 stands detached from the terraces on either side and is set back from the road behind a front garden, the building has a spacious setting which allows for
-

- the appreciation of its architectural characteristics. The host dwelling lies just outside of the southeastern boundary of the Woolwich Common Conservation Area (WCCA), whose significance is largely derived from its topography, 18th and 19th century buildings and verdant, open character.
6. The host dwelling sits on higher ground relative to No. 57. As seen from the street, the proposed ground floor extension would be sited immediately next to the first-floor fenestration of No. 57. The full-height glazing on the western side of the extension would be particularly prominent within public views and would contrast poorly with the distinctive first-floor fenestration of No. 57 directly adjacent. Due to its close proximity, the side-facing glazing of the proposed extension would appear especially incongruous in relation to No. 57 and would therefore have a detrimental effect on its setting. While the proposal would not result in the total loss of the significance of No. 57, it would have a harmful effect on its setting which serves to enhance its significance. As such, the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of No. 57. Furthermore, as the resultant incongruous relationship between No. 57 and the host dwelling could be appreciated from and within the immediate setting of the WCCA, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the setting of the WCCA. While the proposal would not result in the total loss of the significance of the WCCA, the proposal would cause harm to its setting which enhances its significance. As such, the harm that would be caused to the significance of the WCCA would be less than substantial.
 7. In terms of its depth, width and height, the proposed ground floor extension would appear appropriately subservient to the host dwelling and as such would be acceptable on this basis. However, as set out above, the proposal would otherwise cause unacceptable harm to No. 57 and the WCCA.
 8. The appellant states that the proposed extension would not have been visible had a large tree not been recently removed. Regardless, this does not provide justification for the identified harm that would result from the proposal.
 9. The appellant has drawn my attention to an extension to No. 55. However, unlike the proposal, the side elevation of this extension comprises a blank façade and does not relate poorly to the fenestration of No. 57. Furthermore, while the flats to the rear of No. 57 are visible from the street, they are not positioned in such close proximity as the appeal property and as such have a relatively discreet effect on the setting of No. 57.
 10. The appellant states that the proposal has the support of the owners of No. 57. However, no letter of support was submitted by them during the course of the application. Regardless, I have found that the proposal would nonetheless be unacceptable for the reasons set out above.
 11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. However, I do conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the setting of the Woolwich Common Conservation Area, and that the setting of No. 57 Shooters Hill, a grade II listed building, would not be preserved. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies DH(a) of the Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) which states that residential extensions should be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and Policy DH1 of the Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) which require that development proposals should be of the highest

architectural quality and have regard to the form and function of an area, Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) and Policies DH(h) and DH3 of the Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), which state that development proposals should pay special attention to preserving and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and their settings, and Policy DH(i) of the Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) which states that proposals for development that would detract from the setting and proportions of a listed building will be resisted. The proposal would also conflict with the Woolwich Common Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2014), which states that proposals on land outside but affecting the setting of the Conservation Area may be refused if they were to have a detrimental impact.

12. The harm to the setting of both No. 57 and the Woolwich Common Conservation Area would be less than substantial. However, there are no public benefits that would outweigh either of these harms.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR