The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 5 January 2021

**by Mr Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 27 January 2021**

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/20/3260414**
**12 Brome Road, LONDON, SE9 1LD**

- 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 Graham O'Connor against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
- The application Ref 20/0474/HD, dated 11 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2020.
- The development proposed is described as "External Wall Insulation to all solid elevations (front and side and part of rear) at 12 Brome Road SE9 1LD. This consists of a 90mm EPS system to be applied to the solid elevations and finished in a white silicon render (render sample sent via post to your planning department along with the manufacturers material specification). The External Wall Insulation will have a rendered finish and any decorative detailing will be replicated so that the property conforms to the local street scene and its original appearance. The render finish will be like for like to the original render of the property and look identical in terms of aesthetics. The resident is very keen on having this insulation measure installed at their home to improve the energy rating of the property and help the environment by bringing down the energy consumption of the dwelling."

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, bearing in mind the sites location within the Progress Estate Conservation Area.

## Reasons

3. The site lies within the Progress Estate Conservation Area (the CA) and I observed that the significance of this designated heritage asset lies, in part, due to the design of the dwellings that comprise the estate, in particular the detailing and form of the majority of properties which include the distinctive appearance of rafter ends under eaves, as well as shallow window and door reveals and tiled verges to gables. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling which exhibits all of the design characteristics I identify above. As a result, the property is an attractive building which conforms to the defining qualities of the surrounding townscape and positively contributes to the character and appearance of the CA.

4. The appeal scheme proposes the installation of 900mm external wall insulation to all elevations of the property. As a consequence of this addition, the window

and door reveals would become noticeably deeper and a gap at the bottom of the elevations above the damp proof course would also be created. Moreover, the submitted details state that a verge trim will be fitted to the top where the insulation meets the eaves. Given the exposed rafter detailing, this is likely to compromise the appreciation of this feature of the property. It is also unclear how this will be dealt with at the tiled verge to the front gable, as well as around the downpipes. Despite the contention of the appellant, I therefore find that the exterior of the property would not look the same as it currently does.

5. On the basis of the above, I find that the proposal would result in an unacceptable diminution of the attractive detailing present on the host dwelling, which would have consequential detrimental effects on the wider area. Accordingly, the appeal scheme would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area, including the significance of the Progress Estate Conservation Area. Thus, the scheme would conflict with policies DH1, DH3, DH(a) and DH(h) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, as well as policies 7.4 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016). Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure development positively contributes to the improvement of the built environment, that heritage assets are protected, that residential extensions are appropriate to the building and locality, that proposals within conservation areas preserve the character and appearance of that area, that development is informed by the surrounding historic environment and that development affecting heritage assets conserves their significance.

6. In failing to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area, I find that the scheme would result in less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset. As required by paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework, I have had regard to any public benefits of the proposed development. However, any such benefit is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.

**Other Matters**

7. I am conscious that the appellants highlight that the interior of the property suffers from problems associated with damp conditions, which has consequential effects on the health of the occupiers. There would also be a benefit in terms of energy efficiency. Whilst I attribute moderate weight to these matters, it has not been shown that any alternative means of addressing these issues have been explored. In any event, these are not sufficient to outweigh the significant weight that must be attributed to the harm to the conservation area.

**Conclusion**

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Martin Allen*

INSPECTOR