
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2022 by Max Webb BA(Hons)

Decision by Zoe Raygen DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3290990

400 Shooters Hill Road, Blackheath SE18 4LP

- 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 Benjamin Brown against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/1357/HD, dated 12 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a heated, insulated garden room on the eastern side of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a heated, insulated garden room on the eastern side of property at 400 Shooters Hill Road, Blackheath SE18 4LP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/1357/HD, dated 12 April 2021, 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 following approved plans: the site location plan, the block plan and drawing reference 210303221GR1 1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of external surfaces shall be in accordance with the following approved plan: 210303221GR1 1.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Woolwich Common Conservation Area and the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the locally listed host dwelling.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located within the Woolwich Common Conservation Area (CA), which derives its significance from the architectural interest of buildings

throughout. This includes the appeal property which is locally listed and makes a positive contribution to the character of the CA through its own detailed design. The appeal site is bounded to the front by a tall brick wall and to the sides and rear by fencing. Neighbouring the appeal site is a converted water tower, which features a contemporary and contrasting extension.

5. The proposal is for an outbuilding next to the host dwelling that would feature wood cladding and a flat roof. Although it would be constructed of a different material and have a different roof form to the host building, this would ensure the proposal was clearly separate from the main dwelling. The host building would remain the prominent feature and the proposal would not detract from this, but rather appear as its own independent structure, secondary to the dwelling. The proposed outbuilding would not be excessively large or tall, and this would also help to ensure it would appear subordinate to the host building.
6. The nearby extension on the water tower shows how a contemporary style can work to provide separation between the main dwelling and an extension, and this contributes to the existing character of the area. As such, the proposal would appear in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.
7. The proposed outbuilding would be positioned to the eastern side of the property, which means it would be surrounded on all sides by the various boundary treatments. This, combined with its relatively low height and flat roof, would limit the visibility of the outbuilding from the public realm. It would thus not appear visually intrusive in the surrounding area.
8. Overall, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and would not harm the character or appearance of the locally listed host building. It would therefore conform with Policies DH1, DH3, DH(h) and DH(j) of the Core Strategy¹, which together aim to ensure proposals take account of the architecture of surrounding buildings, preserve the character and appearance of conservation areas and conserve the particular characteristics of locally listed buildings. It would also comply with Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (adopted 2021), which together outline how development proposals should enhance local context, with particular regard to conserving the significance of heritage assets.
9. The proposal would accord with the CA Management Strategy², which looks to protect the special character of the CA. Likewise, it would follow the aims of the SPD³, which outlines how outbuildings should be in proportion to the original house and sensitively designed.

Conditions

10. I have recommended the standard time condition for reasons of certainty. For the same reason, I have recommended conditions regarding plans and materials, as well as to ensure an appropriate level of design that protects the character and appearance of the dwelling.

¹ Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (adopted 2014)

² Royal Borough of Greenwich Woolwich Common Conservation Area Management Strategy (adopted 2014)

³ Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (adopted 2018)

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the Development Plan as a whole, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR