



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2017

by Rory MacLeod BA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 09 January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/17/3181583
35 Glaisher Street, London SE8 3ER

- 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 Li Ming Chin against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 17/1400/F, dated 2 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is replacing the garage door to a remote control roller garage door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to an end of terrace house within a modern estate comprising two floors of accommodation over a garage at semi-basement level. The house occupies a central position in two curved terraces of identical design but with their layouts handed so that the garage doors and raised porches are set alongside those of a neighbouring property producing a regular rhythm. The uniformity in design and materials results in a pleasant and cohesive character.
4. The aluminium sections of the proposed replacement roller shutter door would present a strong horizontal texture that would contrast with the recessed panel detailing on existing garage doors in the terrace. The contrast would be emphasised by the proposal's close proximity to the garage door at no. 33 and its large size. No other house within the two terraces has made such a change. The replacement door would be conspicuous in the street scene and would thereby detract from the cohesive character and appearance of these terraces.
5. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016). These require all development to be of a high quality design and amongst other criteria to respond to local character and to take account of existing townscapes and the architecture of surrounding buildings.

6. I have noted the benefits for the appellant that would accrue from the proposed roller shutter door in relation to cost, space saving and ease of operation and that a colour would be chosen to resemble that of the existing door. These benefits would not outweigh the harm that would result to the character and appearance of the area. The appellant also points out variation in the design and colour of some front doors, but these are smaller features and partly obscured by the raised open porches. This point does not lead me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above the appeal is dismissed.

Rory MacLeod

INSPECTOR