

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2022

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 MARCH 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/21/3278788

1 Corelli Road, London, SE3 8EL

- 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 Moroko Property Ltd against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/1496/F, dated 21 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of an existing 2 storey dwelling and erection of a contemporary 3 storey residential development of 5 No. self-contained flats with associated car and cycle parking, waste storage, amenity and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is an unremarkable 3 bed two storey dwelling on a rectangular plot. It sits as something of an anomaly adjoining retail premises and in an area which, while it has housing to the west, has considerable flatted development. The low and mid-rise blocks are generally of traditional brick finished gantry style to the south and contemporary render, brick and coloured panel mix across Shooters Hill Road to the north. The proposal is as described above.
 4. Because of its position near the junction, its forward position, and the space around the site, is a prominent one. In my opinion this prominence only further underlines the principle of ensuring implementation of good design and the creation of a building which should be seen as making a positive, and if possible, uplifting, contribution to the streetscene. Regrettably the appeal proposal would singularly fail to align with these objectives. It would appear as a bland and unimaginative pared-back over-sized rectangular block lacking in showing any meaningful relationship to its surrounds. I recognise the efforts made on the form and detail of the windows as explained by the Appellant. However, even with this, the excessive flank walls would be visually depressing with the front elevation similarly uninspiring and seemingly with add-ons rather
-

than design-integrated articulation and function. The changes in materials would appear almost random and would add little to legibility or genuine interest. The block itself, with no upper level set-backs and meaningful articulation, would look bulky, bland in elevational terms, and have an air of over-development. A modern design idiom should be acceptable here but the appeal scheme would simply look over-ordinary and excessive.

5. Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DH1 and H5 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) have relevance to the case. Taken together, and amongst other matters, they seek to ensure that development is of high-quality design; cognisant of site context and local distinctiveness; of suitable scale, shape and appearance; and generally making a positive contribution to the built environment. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the pertinent development plan policies.

Other matters

6. I recognise that there are a number of technical and environmental issues that are not in dispute. I do appreciate the social and economic benefits with the appeal scheme, and the policy thrust relating to the provision of additional homes and I give this due weight but, in this instance, the environmental impact which I have described outweighs the positive factors. The previously approved scheme has been deemed to be uneconomic by the Appellant. However, I am not persuaded that this should significantly contribute to justification for this *particular* 'replacement' proposal which I consider to be of very uninspiring design. I can see that there might have been some misunderstanding over commentary by the Case Officer during the application process but there is a clear caveat within the correspondence about awaiting an Urban Design Officer's view on the external appearance of the proposed block.
7. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered and the development plan policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR