



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2022

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/22/3298989

45 Aldeburgh Street, Greenwich SE10 0RW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr K Nirvan against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/4055/F, dated 11 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is construction of an attached 3 storey side extension consisting of 2 x 2-bed 3 persons flats located on the first and second floor level, with associated alterations to parking and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. While the reasons for refusal included security and conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, the Council have subsequently withdrawn this concern. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a part three/part four-storey apartment building located along Aldeburgh Street within a largely residential setting although there are some commercial uses nearby including to the rear of the property. The building has a strong, well proportionate, and prominent frontage being located close to the footway with under-croft vehicle parking to the rear. The building also has a clear rhythm of development given its similar pattern to the building line to the front and rear, distance of set back and subtle changes in height. As a result, the building has an overall cohesive layout and appearance despite it being developed in a staged manner. This contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed development would be set back from the building frontage and positioned towards the corner of the eastern elevation extending beyond the rear elevation of the host property. As a result, the proposed development would interrupt the form and layout of the building and this together with the significant height and width would comprise the cohesive appearance of the building appearing as an unbalanced and contrived addition to the property.

6. Changes have been made to the scheme including the reduction in width and height as well as the positioning of the development. However, the proposed development still lacks cohesiveness with the form and layout of the building given the incongruous positioning and overall height and width. The external materials would match the existing property and views of the site would be restricted from certain viewpoints. Nevertheless, the incongruity of the proposed development would be highly visible from Aldeburgh Street and such factors are therefore neutral in my overall decision.
7. I note comments regarding the subordinate nature of the proposals and the appellant has referred to the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) although I have not been provided with a copy of this document. Even if the SPD applied to this scheme, the proposed development would still appear as an unbalanced and contrived addition when viewed in relation to the host property and wider streetscape and would be at odds with the overall character in this particular location.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan, Policies DH1, H5 and H(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies which together, amongst other things, seek to positively respond to local distinctiveness through layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing building types, forms and proportions.

Other Matters

9. I note that the proposed development would deliver a mix of housing within a sustainable location and that there are no technical objections from a number of consultees. However, the modest contribution of two properties would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm identified having regard to character and appearance.

Conclusion

10. The proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area and thus conflicting with the development plan as a whole. There are no other considerations that individually or cumulatively outweigh this harm and development plan conflict. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR