

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2016

by Stephen Normington BSc DipTP MRICS MRTPI FIQ FIHE

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

Decision date: 13 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/16/3159602

Land adjacent to 83 Southwood Road, fronting Colyer Close, Eltham, London SE9 3QH

- 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 Anthony Cope against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 16/0139/F, dated 14 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a new dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises the narrow side garden of No 83 Southwood Road located on a prominent corner plot at the junction with Colyer Close. The site is adjacent to a substantial three-storey semi-detached Victorian Villa. The area in the vicinity of the appeal property comprises of two and three-storey dwellings that have relatively generous plot sizes which give the area a spacious character.
 4. The proposed development would involve the construction of a two-storey detached dwelling, approximately 4.6m wide, with accommodation in the roof space that would occupy the full width of the plot. The proposed western gable would extend up to the boundary of the site with Colyer Close.
 5. Given the narrow width of the plot in comparison to the spacious pattern of development in the locality, the proposed dwelling would appear cramped in relation to its plot size. In addition, by reason of its proposed narrow width and height, the dwelling would have a vertical emphasis that would appear discordant in relation to the design, scale and mass of the surrounding development. It would appear at odds with the existing built form and the spacious character of this part of the street. Consequently, it would offer little
-

relationship with buildings and established development pattern in the immediate vicinity of the site.

6. The proposed side elevation abutting the road, would be prominent in views from both Southwood Road and Colyer Close. Although the property at No 89 on the opposite side of the junction with Colyer Close has an extension that also extends to the boundary of the road, this is single storey and is set further back from the Southwood Road than the appeal proposal. As such, the entrance to Colyer Close has the appearance of being relatively spacious. The prominent mass of the western elevation of the proposed dwelling extending up to the road would cause the entrance to Colyer Close to appear narrower thereby further eroding the spacious character of this part of the street.
7. Taking these matters into account, the proposal does not reflect or respect the prevailing characteristics of the locality and it would form a cramped and discordant feature in the street scene that would cause demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policies H5, H(c) and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy 2014 and Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016. These policies, amongst other things, require residential development to maintain the character of the area by responding to the established layout and spatial pattern with particular regard to scale, design and density.

Other matters

8. My attention has been drawn to the position of the existing access to No 83 and problems with surface water drainage. However, these concerns relate to the existing adjacent property and not the appeal site itself. Consequently, they should be addressed to the Council as they are not matters that I can take into account in the determination of this appeal.
9. I have taken into account the concerns relating to the potential impact of the proposed development on the living conditions of nearby residents with particular regard to overlooking and loss of privacy. However, I agree with the Council that the design and orientation of the proposed dwelling indicates that there would not be any direct overlooking into neighbouring windows.
10. Whilst views of rear gardens may be attainable from the rear bedroom windows of the proposed dwelling, there would be little difference in the views that are already attainable from the rear bedroom windows of No 83. Moreover, given the intervening distance between the appeal site and the gardens of neighbouring properties I do not consider that the proposed development would give rise to any overlooking or loss of privacy of an extent to warrant the dismissal of this appeal on those grounds.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stephen Normington

INSPECTOR