



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19th May 2022

by Megan Thomas Q.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities

Decision date: 16th June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3292854

21 Belford Grove, Woolwich, Greenwich SE18 5DB

- 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 Will Levet and Chloe Pripachailo against the decision of the Royal Borough Council of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref.21/3969/HD, dated 5 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion including additional second storey on existing rear extension, and rear side-return ground floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the roof additions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider terrace, and on the setting of the Woolwich Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Belford Grove is a short cul-de-sac on which there is one row of small terrace houses (nos 17 to 31 odd) on the western side. The appeal site is no.21 and it is mid-terrace. It has two storeys and a two storey rear mono-pitch-roofed outrigger and a small rear garden. No.17 has had an L-shaped loft extension and the Council indicates that it does not have planning permission. check Belford Grove has a mixed character. There is a modern primary school on its eastern site and an industrial estate situated behind and to the south of the row of terrace houses.
4. To the west of the terraced houses and the industrial estate there is a large pond known as Mulgrave Pond and to the west of the Pond there is Rush Grove Mews Terrace and Rush Grove House. The latter is a grade II listed building. The Woolwich Conservation Area boundary skirts around Mulgrave Pond including it and the Rush Grove properties within the Conservation Area. There is mature vegetation around much of the pond perimeter. The appeal site is outside the Conservation Area and does not adjoin it.

5. The proposed development includes erecting a single storey rear extension on the side of the rear outrigger which would have a mono-pitch roof and would infill that part of the rear garden. It would not extend beyond the rear elevation of the outrigger. Also proposed is a flat-roofed dormer structure on the rear roof slope, of full width, and an additional storey on the outrigger with a flat roof at a slightly lower level than the proposed dormer roof. Two rooflights in the front roof slope of the main house would also be inserted.
6. The cumulative impact of the roof dormers would give a very top heavy and disproportionate appearance to the rear of the dwelling. In particular, the width and depth of the proposed storey on the outrigger would be harmful because the structure would extend the full width of the outrigger and its full depth. The mono-pitch roof profile of the outrigger would be usurped and this would unduly detract from the modest original character of the dwelling. In considering the proposed main roof dormer I have borne in mind that there is a reasonable prospect of the appellants using their permitted development rights to undertake a loft extension and as such I do not consider that in isolation the proposed main roof dormer would be materially more harmful than one built under permitted development rights.
7. The proposed double central rooflight in the front elevation would not relate well to the fenestration in the front elevation below and, given its size it would be reasonably prominent in the streetscene. These rooflights and the outrigger development at its proposed dimensions would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider row of terraced houses, whether viewed from public or private land.
8. The proposed rear single storey infill extension would be unobtrusive and would have a mono-pitch roof reflecting the outrigger roof. It would not be of such depth or height that it would unduly detract from the living conditions of the neighbours at no.17 Belford Grove in respect of their outlook or enjoyment of light. No windows are proposed in the south elevation facing no.17 and the rooflights would not allow overlooking of no.17. Consequently, there are no additional loss of privacy issues for the occupants of no.17.
9. Turning to consideration of issues relating to the listed building and the Conservation Area, I am mindful of my statutory duties in s.66 and s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which I do not need to repeat here. The appeal site and its proposed development is too distant from Rush Grove House to meaningfully affect its setting as a listed building. Even if it were possible to glimpse the roof extension from the upper floors of Rush Grove House, this would not translate to the proposal actually harming its setting as a listed building.
10. On my site visit, I considered the question of whether the proposed roof additions could be said to be within the setting of the Conservation Area. Having analysed views out of the Conservation Area and views towards it in the light of the location of the roof additions, my conclusion is that they lie outside the setting of the Conservation Area and would not detract from the significance of the Conservation Area. A combination of distance from the Conservation Area boundaries, the number, scale and orientation of intervening buildings and the wealth of vegetation (even in its winter condition) lead me to conclude that the roof additions are not within the setting of the Conservation Area. In coming to

that conclusion I have borne in mind views from both private and public land both inside and outside the Conservation Area.

11. Overall, I conclude that whilst the proposal would not harm the Woolwich Conservation Area or its setting, the proposed outrigger dormer and front roof slope rooflights would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider terrace. They would be contrary to policies D3 of The London Plan 2021, policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Supplementary Planning Document (December 2018).

Conclusion

10. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas Q.C.

INSPECTOR