



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2023

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3316840

4 Furzefield Road, Blackheath, Greenwich SE3 8TX

- 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 Miss Deanne Chapman against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/3289/HD, dated 30 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of an existing ground floor rear extension and the construction of a ground floor rear and side infill extension; and the construction of a pair of roof dormer extensions at the rear roof slope with 3 roof windows to front roof slope and the demolition and reconstruction of the front garden wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the Rectory Field Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey palisaded mid terrace house with a two storey rear outrigger. It is located on a street of similar properties and within a wider local area made up of artisanal terrace houses. The Council has recognised the importance of this area as a heritage asset through the designation of the CA. Its significance is in relation to its coherent character as a concentrated area of varied but substantially original terraced houses. As such the appeal dwelling contributes to this significance. An Article 4 direction¹ is in place for the CA, which requires planning applications for extensions and alterations similar to much of that of the proposal.
4. In line with the duty imposed on me by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have given considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
5. The proposed brick built rear ground floor extension would have a mono-pitched tile roof and would replace an existing single storey lean-to roofed brick

¹ Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015

extension, which sits to the rear of the existing two storey outrigger. It would wrap around this outrigger and would project further rearward than the existing rear extension, which currently aligns with a similar rear extension to the adjoining terrace house at 6 Furzefield Road. The proposed extension would also infill the side passage between the existing outrigger and the boundary of the appeal property with the rear garden of the neighbouring terraced house at 2 Furzefield Road.

6. The scale of the proposed ground floor rear extension would substantially alter the visual relationship between the appeal dwelling and its small rear garden, which would be substantially reduced in size. This part of the proposal would also result in a significant increase in the ground floor area and footprint of the appeal dwelling, which, as a result would lose much of its stepped appearance and cohesive relationship with the other houses in the terrace. This would result in the proposed ground floor rear extension appearing as overly large, dominating and unduly prominent, and would fail to appear as a subservient addition to the appeal dwelling.
7. The 2 proposed rear dormer windows would be traditionally formed with a tiled pitched roof, which would match and hip with the existing rear roof slope. There are evident examples of similar dormer window extensions to the rear roof slopes of houses similar to the appeal dwelling in the immediate local area. These all appear to reflect the scale, detail, and hierarchy of fenestration of their host dwellings.
8. However, the proposed dormer windows would appear as wider and to not align with the existing windows in the first floor rear elevation of the appeal dwelling. The proposed dormers would also align with the existing roof ridge and would only be set in slightly from the party wall upstands. As such, the proposed roof dormers would appear as overly large and dominating, in relation to the scale of the existing roof and fenestration. This would result in them appearing as unduly prominent and incongruous roof features.
9. The proposal includes 3 rooflights to the existing uninterrupted front roof slope. However, there are very few examples of roof lights in the local area. Where they do exist, they generally appear to be of some age and to interrupt the otherwise continuous and coherent roof slopes of the terraces in which they are installed. The proposed roof lights would vary in size and would not align with the existing front windows in the front elevation, thereby not reflecting the existing pattern of fenestration. For these reasons the proposed rear dormers and front roof lights would not reflect the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and would be unduly prominent in the roofscape of the CA.
10. From the material submitted for the purposes of this appeal and my site visit, I see no reason to demur from the Council's conclusion that the proposed replacement timber sash windows, traditional front door, removal of pebbledash and new boundary treatment would in themselves constitute positive enhancement to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling.
11. However, when considered as a whole I find that, due to the effect of the scale of the proposed rear extension on the existing form of the appeal dwelling and the scale and prominence of the proposed dormers and rooflights, the proposal would result in overly large, prominent and incongruous additions that would not be subservient to the appeal dwelling. This would be apparent in views of

the front and rear of the appeal dwelling and the proposal as a whole would, therefore, fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

12. The appellant has drawn my attention to approved extensions and alterations in the local area and the CA. These would, however, have been considered on their own individual merits and I have done likewise in my consideration of the proposal. It is also noted that some of the many extensions and alterations in the local area are now of some age and that design and conservation practice develops with time.
13. For the reasons given above, the proposal would on balance result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling. This would not accord with the design guidance given in the Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018), and would be contrary to policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014) (the Local Plan), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) (the London Plan) and paragraphs 130 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework). These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions, demonstrate high quality design.
14. Further, for the reasons given, the proposal would on balance fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The proposal would therefore conflict with policies DH3, and DH(h) of the Local Plan and policy HC1 of the London Plan and section 16 of the Framework, which collectively seek to ensure that development has due regard to the importance of preserving or enhancing heritage assets and conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their significance and appreciation within their surroundings.
15. Although I find the harm to the CA would be considered less than substantial, in accordance with the Framework, great weight should be given to the conservation of this heritage asset.
16. Whilst the proposal would result in a larger property with improved amenity for its occupiers, these are primarily private benefits. I must give considerable importance and weight to the effect on the significance of the CA and weight to the effect I have identified on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Overall, I consider that these benefits do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I consider that the appeal should be dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR