

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2022

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3275612

61 Calvert Road, Greenwich, London, SE10 0DG

- 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 Mr Sean McGrath against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/0012/HD, dated 29 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the removal of the existing chimney and change from a hip to a gable roof with no increase in the ridge height.
-

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 host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace dwellinghouse within a road of established residential character. It is unusually and prominently sited on the inside of an almost right angle bend along Calvert Road. The relevant face of the building fronting the west-east stretch of the road, and relatively tight to the inside of the bend, has a hipped roof. The wider street comprises modest scale traditional dwellings with some more modern larger development occurring, most notably towards the road-ends. The locality is one of pleasing appearance and the existing property makes a positive contribution to the scene. The proposal is as described above.
 4. The existing build sits very comfortably within the street. Its hipped elevation provides an air of spaciousness notwithstanding the tightness of the road bend and very pleasingly mirrors the front roof slopes of the those pitched roof houses which run to its west on the north side of Calvert Road. Looking from the west in particular the scene is pleasantly low key. Regrettably the appeal proposal would markedly erode the attributes I have outlined. Even without raising the ridge height and with using matching materials the change would be jarring on the eye. The altered building would look overly dominant in the scene with a scale at upper level unduly large and an appearance out of sync with the neighbouring homes to the west. It would stand too dominantly at the
-

end of the row and on the inside of the bend. Regrettably the appeal scheme would appear ungainly and overly bulky and lack the subtle element of the existing situation or represent good design which would be appropriate for this property and this locality.

5. Policies DH1 and DH(a) 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, sympathetic to its surroundings and integrating in the streetscene, suitable in form for its context, and protective of visual amenity. This is reflected in the advice and objectives of the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD) albeit that document cannot be expected to cover every eventuality. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the relevant development plan policies and the pertinent aims of the SPD.

Other matters

6. I understand the wish of the Appellant to increase storage space and improve thermal efficiency and I note that there are no neighbour objections or impacts upon residential amenity. I recognise the reduction in scale relative to a previous proposal. It is not within my remit to comment on 'permitted development'; a planning application has been made and the scheme is before me. I have considered the other examples of gables drawn to my attention, some innocuous and some discordant in my view, but I found none to be directly comparable to the appeal proposal in terms of position. In any event I must assess the case before me on its own merits.
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 host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR