

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2015

**by Nick Fagan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 13 March 2015**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/A/14/2229295**  
**16 Greenwich Church Street, London SE10 9BJ**

- 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 & Mrs Michael & Vilas Totty against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
  - The application Ref 14/2455/F, dated 28 August 2014, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2014.
  - The development proposed is described as alterations and loft extension to residential upper parts of the former Meridian Pharmacy and internal arrangements.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a third floor extension and internal alterations forming a one-bedroom flat on the first floor and a two-bedroom maisonette on the second and third floors at 16 Greenwich Church Street, London SE10 9BJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 14/2455/F, dated 28 August 2014, 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: 10057 P2/P01A, P02A, P03A, P04A & P05A.
  - 3) No development shall take place until samples of: (i) the bricks to be used to raise the front parapet of the property up to the level of No 14 adjacent; (ii) the glazed barrier above them; (iii) the glass canopy above the glazed timber doors opening onto the third floor terrace, and (iv) the covering for the metal standing seam roof of the additional storey hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

### Procedural Matter

2. I have altered the description of the proposal in my decision above to essentially reflect that set out in the Council's decision notice because it more accurately reflects the nature of the development.

## **Main Issue**

3. The main issue in this case is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the West Greenwich Conservation Area and the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site (WHS).

## **Reasons**

4. The appeal property is a three storey terraced building in a prominent location in the centre of Greenwich town centre. It lies within the Conservation Area and WHS and is also a locally listed building. Although the site also backs onto Turnpin Lane the proposal is essentially to add a third floor onto the Victorian building facing Charlton Church Street in order to create two self-contained residential units in this part of the building. It has an existing 'butterfly' roof with a parapet, although this is not prominent in views from the street.
5. This urban block between Nelson Street and Dunford Street has generally three storey buildings, although the property on the corner of the former is four storeys. However the individual buildings are of contrasting one-off designs with floor levels at different heights such that No 16 is lower than its immediate neighbours. Its front elevation is also faced in yellow London stock bricks contrasting with its rendered neighbours, and it is very slightly recessed from them.
6. The proposed additional storey with its curved profiled metal roof would be set back approximately 2.5m from the front face of the building such that it would not be particularly prominent from the street, especially at close quarters or from the opposite side of the road. The height of the new roof would match the height of No 18's front parapet. The parapet of No 16 would be built up with three layers of matching bricks to match the height of the extruded brick course at No 14 next door on top of which a glazed screen would be affixed for the privacy, amenity and safety of the occupiers of the maisonette who would access a private outdoor terrace/patio through 4-panel timber folding doors.
7. Whilst such a modern glazed screen would be prominent from the local street scene it would be no higher than the parapet of the adjoining building at No 14. I see no reason why such a contemporary alteration to the building's front elevation would be unacceptable, although the details of the screen's precise materials and fixings would be important and require reserving by condition.
8. Glimpses of the additional storey would probably be visible from more distant views including from the High Road to the south but it would be no higher than the neighbour at No 18 and would not be prominent. Its modern curved roof would not be unacceptable providing the specific materials to be used would be of a sufficiently high specification and durable quality. Again, this could be required by condition.
9. Although No 66 and the terrace of which it forms a part are an important component of the street scene of this part of the town centre I see no reason to prevent any changes to it and in particular the changes proposed by this development, for the above reasons. Indeed the buildings within the town centre, Conservation Area and World Heritage Site are sufficiently diverse to accommodate appropriate well designed alterations like those proposed here. Contemporary additions and alterations to older buildings can be successful

because they purposely contrast in terms of design and materials with those of the original building and I consider this would be the case in this instance.

10. The additional storey and its associated elevational changes to the rear would have little impact on the street scene in Turnpin Lane. Although there may be glimpses of the new external metal stairs to the new residential units these would be set back from the Lane and would be acceptable.
11. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of this locally listed building, the West Greenwich Conservation Area and the WHS.
12. Policy H5 of the Council's adopted Core Strategy with Development Management Policies (CS) requires new residential development to comply with CS Policy DH1 as well as a long list of criteria none of which the Council suggests the development does not comply with. Policy DH1 requires high quality design and that developments provide a positive relationship with their existing urban context. For the above reasons, the proposal would comply with this Policy. CS Policy DH(a) states that residential extensions including roof extensions should be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality. For the above reasons, the proposed roof extension would meet these requirements.
13. CS Policies DH3 and DH(h) together state that heritage assets will be protected and enhanced, and essentially apply the statutory test in respect of Conservation Areas. The proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, this locally listed building and the WHS and it would therefore comply with these Policies. CS Policy DH4 states that the WHS's Outstanding Universal Values will be protected and enhanced. Beyond its refusal reason it is unclear why the Council considers the proposed development will breach this Policy and for the reasons given above I fail to see how it would do so.

### **Conditions and Conclusion**

14. As set out above, I consider that details of various external materials to be submitted to and approved by the Council prior to commencement of development are required in order that its appearance is satisfactory within its historic town centre context. Hence details of all the materials set out in Condition 3 above are necessary. The Council has not submitted a list of conditions but I also consider an additional one is necessary listing the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of good planning.
15. Subject to these conditions and for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Nick Fagan*

INSPECTOR