



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2022

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3298138

4 Bushmoor Crescent, London SE18 3EF

- 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 Mathew Williams against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/0072/HD, dated 10 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Shrewsbury Park Estate Conservation Area and its effect on the host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located within the Shrewsbury Park Estate Conservation Area (CA). The CA is an inter-war residential estate comprising detached and semi-detached dwellings of similar age and appearance. The properties are set within treelined streets that create an attractive and verdant suburban environment. The general uniformity of the design of the dwellings and their largely retained original features, such as double-storey bay windows to the front and rear, make a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.
4. The appeal property retains the original rear bay feature, although the windows and doors have been replaced at some point in the past. The appeal proposal would comprise the erection of a single-storey rear extension with a mono-pitched roof that would rise upwards from the rear of the extension to connect to the house just below the first floor window. This would result in the loss of the majority of the rear bay. In addition the mono-pitched roof would be at odds with the roof form of the host building and would relate awkwardly to the retained part of the bay. As such the proposal would be an overly prominent and incongruous addition that would, due to its size, form and design, result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property.

5. As the double-storey bays are such a key feature of the appearance of the CA, I also find that the proposal would fail to preserve the CA. The harm would be less than substantial. I recognise that the proposal would provide a public benefit in respect of contributing to the local economy during the construction period. However, I do not consider that this benefit would outweigh the harm identified above.
6. For these reasons the proposal fails to comply with Policies DH1, DH3, DH(a) and DH(h) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), which seek development that pays special attention to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. The proposal is also contrary to the aims of Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions SPD (December 2018), the CA Appraisal (2013) and the CA – Article 4 Direction Guidance Note (2016). The latter 2 documents state that rear extensions should not enclose or result in the loss of the original rear bay feature or fabric.
7. The appellant has referred to approved schemes for rear extensions in the CA, most of which include the demolition of existing rear elements. None of these consented schemes is directly comparable to the appeal proposal. As each planning application and appeal must be considered on its individual merits and against current development plan policy, I attribute limited weight to the schemes referred to.
8. I recognise that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring property and there have been no objections from neighbours. I also note that the proposal would improve the energy efficiency of the appeal property. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR