



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2019

by Euan FS Pearson BA(Hons) BTP FRGS MRICS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/19/3220725

Land adjacent to 83 Southwood Road, Eltham, London SE9 3QF

- 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 the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 18/0871/O, dated 12 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2018.
 - The development proposed is outline application with (all matters reserved) for the construction of a two storey plus basement, single dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the decision notice and appeal form as this is more precise than that on the application form.
3. The application was made in outline with all matters reserved for subsequent approval. Other than the location plan, I have treated the drawings submitted with the application as indicative only.
4. I have taken into account the planning history of the site, in particular earlier appeals dismissed in December 2016 and October 2017.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a narrow plot to the side of No 83 Southwood Road, a substantial semi-detached three-storey Victorian style property. The appeal site is prominently located on the corner with Colver Close and due to its orientation, relates visually to Southwood Road. There is a brick built garage at the southern end of the plot, adjacent to an electricity sub-station building. The surrounding area is characterised by two and three storey residential properties within spacious plots.

7. The shape and size of the appeal site is inconsistent with the wide and spacious plots along Southwood Road. The indicative plans show a single storey dwellinghouse, attached to No 83, across the width of the appeal site, to a depth of around 12m and to a height of around 7m, so as to accommodate an upper floor in the roof space. The appellant states that the proposed dwellinghouse has been reduced in scale, relative to earlier proposals. However, this would still be at odds with the established development pattern in the immediate vicinity and would result in a cramped form of development.
8. No 83 forms a pair with 81 Southwood Road. No 81 has not been extended to the side, and I consider that building onto the side of No 83, particularly to a height of 7m would unbalance the pair thus harming the appearance of the street scene.
9. I accept that the plans submitted are indicative only. However, the constraints imposed by the size and shape of the appeal site limit the type, scale and form of development that can be accommodated. The plans, I consider, do not demonstrate that the proposed dwellinghouse of this scale and height could be built without detriment to the character and appearance of the area.
10. Therefore, I consider that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would not comply with Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016; Policies H5, H(c) and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2016; and the National Planning Framework 2019. These, amongst other things, require development to be of a high quality, respect local context, and make a positive contribution to its character. The Framework requires approval of development that complies with an up-to-date development plan; this does not.

Other Matters

11. The appellant draws my attention to such matters as: living conditions, amenity of neighbours, car/cycle parking, and ecology, stating that required standards would be achievable. The Council does not disagree, and I see no reason to either.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Euan FS Pearson

INSPECTOR