



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2020

**by D Hilton-Brown BSc (Hons) CIEEM**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 12 February 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/3240708**

**Rear of 65 Avery Hill Road, New Eltham, London SE9 2BJ**

- 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 S Smith against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
  - The application Ref 19/2927/F, dated 21 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2019.
  - The development proposed is the use as an office and store (B1/B8) and erection of first floor addition.
- 

### 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 property is a garage located behind 65 Avery Hill Road; it is a separate unit, under different ownership and with no association with No 65. The properties to the front of this garage consist of retail units to the ground floor and residential premises on the first floor. The structures to the rear of this section of Avery Hill Road are all single storey garages and storage units of varying sizes and designs. These are accessed by a service road to the rear of the retail units which connects with Sparrows Lane.
4. The appeal proposal would result in the construction of an additional storey onto the existing garage. This new first floor development would be used as an office, while the ground floor would be used for storage and parking.
5. This new addition would consist of a mansard style roof with a maximum height of approximately 5.6 m. The structure would also have windows in the front and rear elevations of the second storey. This would lead to an increased height of approximately 2.25m, in a line of buildings which are characterised by single storey structures with little fenestration.
6. The original design and character of this part of Avery Hill is of two storey properties fronting onto the main road. While the single storey garages to the rear are subservient and remain secondary to the residential properties. Allowing two storey development in this area would dominate this building line

and detract from the main Avery Hill properties as well as the buildings in Stanley Close. This would lead to a detrimental change in the character and appearance of the immediate vicinity. The proposal would therefore be an incongruous and inharmonious feature.

7. I acknowledge the proposed development would be at the far end of the service road. However, due to the proposed development's scale and mass, it would be clearly visible from the first-floor residential properties on Avery Hill Road, which back onto this access road. Furthermore, despite the boundary fence, the development would be visible from Stanley Close. Partial views would also be apparent from the junction of the service road and Sparrows Lane.
8. I have taken into account the appellant's statement in relation to positive design and improvements gained by bringing the building into a better state of repair. However, these would not outweigh the harm I have identified.
9. I have considered Policies EA1 and TC7 of the Core Strategy, which are referenced in support of this development. The appellant considers that the proposal would provide potential economic benefits and enhancements to the neighbourhood parade. However, these matters carry limited weight in this case, as little substantive evidence has been provided. Consequently, they do not alter the harm I have already identified or alter my decision.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would detract significantly from the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, it does not comply with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Spatial Development Strategy for London (2016) and Policy DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan, Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, July 2014 (Core Strategy). Together these policies require development to have regard to local character and maintain the pattern and grain of existing spaces with particular regard to scale and mass.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons detailed above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

*D Hilton-Brown*

INSPECTOR