



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2021

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/20/3258324

5 Nevada Street, Greenwich SE10 9JL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Architecture and Partners llp against Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0997/HD, is dated 24 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is an extension and minor internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension and minor internal alterations at 5 Nevada Street, Greenwich SE10 9JL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/0997/HD, dated 24 March 2020 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: P001, P002, P003 Rev A & P004 Rev A.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matters and Reasons

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. However, the original description adequately describes the proposal and I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The proposal relates to a single storey rear extension to the rear of the residential 5 Nevada Street to provide enlarged kitchen and dining space. The property is locally listed along with numbers 4, 6 and 7 and sits within the West Greenwich Conservation Area (the Conservation Area) and the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site (MGWHS).
4. The appeal was submitted on the basis of the failure of the Council to determine the planning application within the prescribed period. However, the Council's Statement of Case (SoC) clearly sets out that they consider the proposal to be acceptable. It is clear from the SoC that they do not object to the proposal in relation to its effect on the character and appearance of the

area, the amenity of neighbouring occupiers or in terms of the resultant garden space.

5. There are, therefore, no points of dispute or matters of contention between the main parties and it has not been advanced that the proposal would fail to accord with the relevant development plan policies and guidance¹. From all that I have seen, including a site visit to view the appeal property and surrounding area, I see no reason to reach a different conclusion.
6. The evidence indicates that the locally listed terrace within which the property sits has a group value relating to the grade II listed Spread Eagle and locally listed Greenwich Theatre both located closely to the west through its contribution to the intimate scale of Nevada Street. The intimate nature, form and scale of the buildings within the immediate area form one of the defining features of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area in this location.
7. Given that the extension would be tucked away to the rear, which is of less significance than the frontage of the building, the proposal would have a neutral impact on the Conservation Area, therefore preserving its character and appearance. For the same reasons the proposal would preserve the setting of the nearby listed building and would have no unacceptable impact on the locally listed terrace, theatre nor the MGWHS.
8. Therefore, for the reasons set out and having considered all other matters raised, I have nothing before me that would lead me to conclude that my decision should be anything other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conditions

9. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three-year time limit. Matching materials are required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. It is necessary that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

10. The appeal should therefore be allowed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR

¹ Policies DH(a), DH(b), DH(h), DH(j), DH1 and DH4 the Royal Greenwich Local Plan (2014), Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) & Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance December 2018.