



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th MARCH 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3308459

45 Lee Road, London SE3 9RT

- 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 and Mrs Smith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/2258/HD, dated 4 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as a loft conversion with side facing rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has submitted some amended drawings with the appeal which include material changes to the proposal. As the Council and other parties have not had an opportunity to view and comment on these drawings I consider it prejudicial to determine the appeal on the basis of this new material. For the avoidance of doubt, the appeal has been considered against the drawings listed on the decision notice.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Blackheath Park Conservation Area (BPCA).

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached dwelling with a hipped roof, a symmetrically arranged main frontage and a single-storey wing to one side. The property and its neighbours were built in the 1950s. This group of detached houses generally reflect the scale and proportions of earlier houses in the BPCA and therefore, together with the mature vegetation bordering the road, make a positive contribution to the BPCA's character and appearance.
5. The property has been extended to the rear in the recent past and the rear elevation comprises a pair of symmetrically arranged wings either side of a double-storey glazed element, above which there is a deep valley. The wings

feature shallow pitched hipped roofs that complement the form of the main roof.

6. The proposal would comprise the raising of the ridge and eaves of the main roof together with a more significant increase in the height of the rear parts of the roof and the formation of gables facing the garden. A substantial area of flat roof would be formed behind the ridges to enable the creation of a bedroom, en-suite, office and dressing room within the expanded roof form. Rooflights would be installed in the side roof slopes and some of the drawings before me suggest a balcony would be formed between the rear-facing gables.
7. Viewed front-on, the proposal would result in minimal change in respect of the front elevation of the appeal property. However, the overall form of the roof, which would be apparent in oblique views and from neighbouring gardens, would be bulky, overly prominent and at odds with the scale and form of roofs in the area. The vertical element between the rear-facing gables, with its large opening and potential roof terrace, would be a particularly incongruous and alien element that would severely detract from the appearance of the host property and its surroundings.
8. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the host building and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the BPCA. The harm in this respect would be substantial.
9. The proposal therefore fails to accord 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. There is also conflict with the aims of Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), the Blackheath Park Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2013), and the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018).

Conclusion

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

S Poole

INSPECTOR