



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/22/3312744

The White Horse, 704 Woolwich Road, Greenwich SE7 8LQ

- 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 Heathborne Limited against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/2119/F, dated 22 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a loft extension in the form of raising of the roof between two pitched roofs and reconfiguring of the third floor to create additional communal space for an existing HMO and formation of 15 rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft extension in the form of raising of the roof between two pitched roofs and reconfiguring of the third floor to create additional communal space for an existing HMO and formation of 15 rooflights at The white Horse, 704 Woolwich Road, Greenwich SE7 8LQ in accordance with the terms of the application, 22/2119/F, dated 22 June 2022, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: SE78LQ-PL-PR-FRONT- 201-R3, SE78LQ-PL-PR-SEC2- 302-R3, SE78LQ-PL-PR-SEC1- 301-R3, SE78LQ-PL-PR-ROOF- 105-R3, SE78LQ-PL-PR-REAR- 203-R3, SE78LQ-PL-PR-FRONT- 201-R3, SE78LQ-PL-PR-EAST- 202-R3, A.03 R5, A.04 R5, A.05 R5 and the ATN Property Ltd Report for Brick and Wall and Structural Advice dated 10 December 2021.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the description of development varies between documents submitted, I have used the description from the Council's decision notice, as this most accurately describes the proposal and has been used by the appellant for their appeal statement.
3. The appellant has submitted revised plans with the appeal, these show the enlargement of the first floor kitchen. This is intended to overcome concerns regarding kitchen provision for the 22 person maximum residential capacity of the HMO. Given that the Council and other interested parties have had

opportunity to comment on the revised plans, I have accepted the drawings in line with the Wheatcroft principles¹.

The main issue

4. The Council have confirmed that they accept that the revised plan Ref: A.03 R5 overcomes their concerns regarding kitchen provision for the maximum residential capacity of the HMO. For this reason, the Council has withdrawn Reason 2 of its reasons for refusal, as set out on their decision notice for the application 22/2119/F dated 13 September 2022. I see no reason to demur from the Council's conclusion in this regard.
5. The main issue of this appeal is, therefore, the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and that of the local area, with reference to the Thames Barrier and Bowater Road Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a three storey late Victorian building, with a public house at ground level and residential use above, in the form of an HMO. It is a locally listed building, the significance of which stems from its Victorian public house architecture and the prominent role this plays in the local townscape. As such, the appeal property contributes to the significance of the CA, which rests in its Victorian industrial riverside character.
7. The CA is a heritage asset to which I have a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
8. From my site visit it would appear that the loft extension that is the subject of this appeal has been implemented. The application for the development is, therefore, retrospective, and I have considered and determined this appeal accordingly.
9. The main part of the proposed loft extension sits between two pitched roofs that engage with a pair of gables on the rear elevation, infilling the valley between the two. This extension aligns with the ridge height of the two pitched roofs, is set substantially in from the rear elevation and is finished in tiling matched to that of the original roof. The other alterations to brickwork, which mainly comprise structural repairs, are also done in materials that match existing.
10. From street level the loft extension is only visible from the rear of the property on Clevely Close, from where it is seen as being set back from the roof edge and to not extend above the roof ridges between which it is located. As such, the loft extension does not appear to dominate the roof, rather it appears as a subordinate addition.
11. Whilst the front of the locally listed appeal building makes a significant contribution to the local townscape, the rear is more functional. Due to its modest scale and by matching the existing materials, the loft extension matches with this more functional aspect of the building's architecture and does

¹ Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v SSE [JPL 1982 P37]

not appear as an unduly prominent addition to the roof of this locally listed building.

12. Whilst the development includes many rooflights, these are within a large double pitched roof on a substantial Victorian building. Many of the roof lights are also positioned on parts of the roof slopes that are not readily visible from the public realm and, therefore the rooflights as a whole have a limited visual presence on the roof.
13. For these reasons, and following paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the NPPF), my balanced judgement is that the loft extension and roof lights do not result in harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property, and sustain the significance of the dwelling as a locally listed building and the contribution it makes to the local townscape.
14. Similarly, I find that the small scale, complementary materials and limited views of the loft extension and rooflights result in the development having a minimal visual presence in local views and do not cause any harm to the significance of the CA and, therefore, preserve its character and appearance.

Conditions

15. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions should I allow the appeal. As the development has been implemented, there is no reason to attach conditions regarding the timing of the development or materials.
16. As there is no information before me that details any local issues regarding impacts on the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers and the standard of accommodation delivered by the development meets the requirements for a 22 person HMO, the suggested condition limiting occupancy to 15 persons is not necessary. As such, it fails one of the six tests for conditions set out in the NPPF (2021) and the Planning Practice Guidance.
17. For necessary clarity and in the interest of design quality I have attached a plans condition that includes the revised plan submitted by the appellant with the appeal.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR