



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2024 by N Manley BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 DECEMBER 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3343849

62 Prince Rupert Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 1LA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Clive Taylor against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/0604/HD.
 - The development proposed is described as the demolition of existing side conservatory replaced with single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal site is situated in the Progress Estate Conservation Area (CA). I shall therefore have special regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
4. The officer's report from the Council references the Royal Borough Greenwich Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document as dated from 2023. To ensure clarity, the version of documentation I have been provided is only dated as 2022 and I will refer to it as so in this recommendation. I am confident that this adjustment does not disadvantage any party involved.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the host property and the CA

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. According to the Progress Estate Conservation Area Character Appraisal (PECACA), the CA derives historical significance from its association with the Royal Arsenal in Woolwich, with the estate's construction in 1915 reflecting the government's response to housing needs arising from the Royal Arsenal Co-operative Society. The PECACA also heralds the estate's unified character, describing it as following in the tradition of garden suburb town planning. Insofar as it relates to this appeal, the special interest of the CA is largely defined by its consistent architectural style, characterised by two-storey

dwelling, regular fenestration patterns, and a varied yet rhythmic use of gables. These elements combine to create a distinct character of a quiet Garden suburb quality, giving the dwellings a high value when viewed as a collective.

7. The appeal site, 62 Prince Rupert Road (no 62) is situated to the northern side of Prince Rupert Road, near the junction with Shrapnel Road. The host property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling which has been extended at some point to the side with a conservatory. Also visible is a front and generous side garden. No 62 exemplifies the design features highlighted in the PECACA, such as its consistent architectural style and regular fenestration patterns. Consequently, I consider the property to contribute positively to the significance of the CA.
8. The Council's concerns relate to the proposed side extension and I shall therefore restrict my further consideration to this aspect of the proposal. The proposed roof form would in my view be acceptable, as it would minimise the bulk of the addition. However, the proposed positioning and limited setback distance of the side extension would result in an extension that would be insufficiently recessed from the existing front elevation. This would make the extension appear as a continuation of the original front elevation, rather than a subordinate addition to the main building, making no 62's front elevation appear wider than that of the other end of terrace properties nearby, disrupting the architectural appearance of the terrace and contrasting harmfully against other similar terraces nearby.
9. Furthermore, the proposed extension would result in a blank, unadorned façade along the front-facing elevation, creating a large and unbroken surface that appears incongruous when compared to the consistent window patterns of neighbouring properties and the host property itself. The side elevation would feature two windows of differing shapes, sizes and sill heights, positioned closely together in a manner that poorly reflects the original dwelling's proportions and fenestration layout. Overall, the design of the extension would disrupt the regular pattern of fenestration characteristic of the CA, resulting in a discordant addition that does not harmonise with its surroundings or the architectural style of the host property.
10. Although there is an existing side conservatory in place, it currently includes a front elevation with a door and window, unlike the proposed blank elevation in this appeal. From the evidence before me and my observations on site, the existing conservatory appears to be in poor condition, and no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that it benefits from planning permission. Nevertheless, the proposed extension would cause greater harm to the significance of the CA than the existing conservatory, further detracting from its character and appearance.
11. The appellant has suggested the proposed extension would not be visible from the street scene due to the existing front boundary fence on the appeal site. However, from my observations on site, although this does limit some views of the site, it does not obscure it entirely and the extension would remain particularly prominent from several viewpoints along the street scene. In any case, there is no guarantee the fence would remain in place, as it could be removed at any time by the occupier of the property. Consequently, I have afforded this limited weight.

12. Given the above, the appeal scheme would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the CA, to which I ascribe considerable importance and weight. The proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA. In such circumstances, paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. However, there have been no public benefits presented by the appellant which would outweigh the identified harm.
13. The proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the host property and the CA. Consequently, it would contravene Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (adopted 2021) and Policies DH3, DH(a) and DH(h) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted 2014) and Chapters 12 and 14 of the Framework. Collectively, these policies stipulate, amongst other requirements, that development should be of a high-quality design, positively respond to local distinctiveness, pay special attention to protecting heritage assets and see side additions limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality. Moreover, it would not align with the aims of the Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2022) which requires extensions to be well thought-out and carefully planned.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

N Manley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR