



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/W/22/3301209

14 Phineas Pett Road, London SE9 6RH

- 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 Mrs Lorraine Tierney against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/3695/HD, dated 13 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a crossover and blocked drive using permeable block paving.
-

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 Progress Estate Conservation Area (PECA) and its effect on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey mid-terrace house which is situated in a residential street. It forms part of the Progress Estate which was constructed in 1915 by the Office of Works to house the munitions workers who worked at Woolwich Arsenal. The Estate is a relatively well-preserved example of the garden suburb movement of town planning featuring low density housing laid out in an informal picturesque fashion with ample green spaces.
4. The majority of the houses in the Estate retain the distinctive timber fences and gates to their front boundaries behind which are hedges and/or lawns and planting. The fences play an important part in giving unity to the Estate's character and the landscaping is a key aspect of the picturesque garden suburb aesthetic. These elements make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the PECA and are matters to which I attach significant weight.
5. As noted in the PECA Character Appraisal (2007) those front gardens that have been converted to parking are significantly intrusive and disrupt the carefully designed townscapes. This is very evident in parts of Phineas Pett Road albeit the houses to either side of the appeal property retain front gardens.

6. The proposal would comprise the construction of a vehicular crossover at the front of the appeal property and the formation of a paved driveway to provide off-street parking for one car. This would leave minimal space for planting in front of the house and only a small section of fence could be reinstated on the front boundary.
7. The loss of soft landscaping and scope to re-instate a fence along the entirety of the property's front boundary, together with the urbanising effect of an open front boundary with hard surfacing, would have an unacceptable and detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. Consequently the proposal would result in substantial harm to the PECA and fail to preserve its character and appearance.
8. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policies DH1, DH3 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. There is also conflict with the aims of the PECA Character Appraisal, which states that the introduction of a paved, concrete or other hard standing into a front garden to create car parking space will significantly damage the character of the estate.
9. The appellant has referred to a newly built pair of houses nearby in the Progress Estate that include a crossover and hardstanding at the front. These houses do not form part of a terrace and include a timber fence along much of the front boundary. As such this scheme is not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. In any case, each planning application and appeal must be considered on its individual merits and against current development plan policy. I therefore accord limited weight to this matter.
10. This appeal must be considered on the basis of information provided. I note the appellant's willingness to make changes to the proposal but cannot take into account an alternative scheme that is not before me.

Conclusion

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

S Poole

INSPECTOR