



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2024 by N Unwin BSc (hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by A Price BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5900/W/24/3345552

14 Grove Road, London E3 5AX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Khuswant Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Tower Hamlets.
 - The application Ref is PA/24/00508.
 - The development proposed is described as the replacement of windows on front elevation at ground first and second floor levels; associated alterations to ground floor front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the replacement of windows on front elevation at ground first and second floor levels; associated alterations to ground floor front elevation at 14 Grove Road, London E3 5AX in accordance with the terms of the application ref. PA/24/00508, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; A11; VS Plus Sash Section Identification Guide; and VS Plus Aluminium Sash Windows.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on the hereby approved plans.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal property is located within a conservation area. In line with section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Tredegar Square Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a three-storey building adjoining the highway. It is located within the CA. This section of the CA is defined by a wide section of highway, adjoined in part by a locally listed row of buildings comprising 2-12 Grove Road. These properties are of traditional construction and vary in scale and design, typically with shopfronts at ground floor level. To the north of these properties there is a stark shift to a more residential character, with locally listed 16-46 Grove Road formed primarily of terraced properties. The appeal property is not locally listed.
6. The Tredegar Square Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Guidelines (2008) (CACA) defines the character of the CAs streets as a repetition of architectural elements to create a finely textured surface to the continuous building frontages. These features positively contribute to the character and appearance of the CA and thereby to its significance as a designated heritage asset.
7. The appeal site forms the end of a block of contemporary flats constructed in a pastiche style. The iteration of the fenestration along much of the front of the block contributes to the repetition of architectural elements seen within the surrounding area and highlighted within the CACA. Nevertheless, the appeal property deviates from the homogeneity of the wider block, with shopfront features at ground floor level. The pastiche design and scale of the existing shopfront, located within a modern apartment block, appears somewhat confused and cramped here, and, to an extent, disrupts the character transition from commercial to residential. Overall, I find that the appeal property makes a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.
8. The proposal would replace the existing timber framed windows, including shopfront, with powder coated aluminium framed windows. Whilst the windows within the apartment block are typically timber framed, the use of a more contemporary material, as proposed, would not appear out of context here given the range of window and shopfront materials found in the surrounding area, particularly to the immediate south of the site. Moreover, the building itself is clearly a modern intervention, the shopfront is not historic and the proposed windows would replicate the design of those within the wider block. The replacement of the former shopfront with a ground floor window to match that of the wider apartment block, together with matching metal railings, would preserve the architectural repetition and uniformity of the block. In addition, the proposal would maintain the transition between the residential and commercial areas along Grove Road.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would have a neutral effect on, and would therefore preserve, the character and appearance of the CA as a whole. Accordingly, the proposal would not harm the significance of this designated heritage asset and would therefore comply with the relevant provisions of Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies S.DH1 and S.DH3 of the Tower Hamlets Local Plan 2031 (2020). These policies, when read together, require new developments to complement and enhance their immediate and wider surroundings, and preserve or, where appropriate, enhance the borough's designated and non-designated heritage assets.

Conditions

10. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. Details of the materials and design of the proposal are included within the submitted plans and secured through condition, therefore an additional condition requiring the further submission of these details is unnecessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would accord with the development plan and there is nothing sufficiently compelling to lead me to find otherwise. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

A Price

INSPECTOR