



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/19/3239252

1 Keeling Road, Eltham, London SE9 6AA

- 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 Kham Chu against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 19/0373/F, dated 11 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a new one 3 bedroomed semi-detached dwelling and one 2 bedroomed detached dwelling to rear garden plot, with associated parking and gardens.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:

(a) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and;

(b) the effect of the development on the living conditions of the future occupiers of the proposed attached dwelling house, having particular regard to sunlight and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The proposed buildings, associated parking and gardens would be set within the side garden area of 1 Keeling Road (the host property) which occupies a corner plot. The immediate area is residential, consisting mostly of terraced and semi-detached properties of a similar style and character. The appeal site is adjacent to the Eltham Green Conservation Area (CA). This area comprises mostly of larger detached houses of a different character to Keeling Road.
4. The Council consider that the proposal would have no detrimental impact on the CA. From my site visit and the evidence before me, I would agree with the Council's assessment, that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the adjoining CA.
5. This proposal would construct 2 new residential properties. The existing end terraced house would be extended to create a self-contained, 3-bedroom semi-

detached dwelling. Additionally, a 2-bedroomed detached house would be built in the garden of No 1. There are different issues and characteristics relating to each proposed property and I will therefore address the proposals separately below.

Character and appearance – the semi-detached dwelling

6. The terraced block and other houses in the immediate vicinity shared particular characteristics due to their design. One clear feature on the end terraced properties and many of the semi-detached neighbouring properties, was a stepped back elevation feature to the front façade.
7. The proposed semi-detached building would briefly continue this feature before stepping forward to the existing front elevation building line. The subsequent loss of the characteristic stepped back feature and the creation of an inset in the front elevation building line would result in an incongruous and discordant feature. Consequently, the established pattern and symmetry of the terraced block would become unbalanced. While I acknowledge the scale of the semi-detached extension is acceptable, the design would fail to maintain the character of the area.
8. Therefore, it would not comply with criteria v of Policy H(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, 2014 (Core Strategy).

Character and appearance – the detached dwelling

9. The appellant considers that the corner plot of No 1 is a distinctive and separate plot with different characteristics. However, it was clear from my site visit that this land is closely associated with No 1 in the form of a garden. In addition, this corner plot is situated directly opposite similar properties on the north western side of Keeling Road. I have therefore considered the proposed detached dwelling in relation to the character of the surrounding area and not just the interrelationship it would have with its position in this section of Keeling Road.
10. The new detached property would fail to correspond with almost any existing building lines or patterns of development within the immediate vicinity and would therefore lead to an overall unsympathetic and inharmonious appearance.
11. Furthermore, the detached property's dimensions would lead to a long and narrow dwelling which would be out of proportion to the properties in the immediate vicinity. Additionally, the building would have a blank and almost featureless side elevation facing directly onto Keeling Road. The building would hold a prominent corner position, visible to those entering or leaving the estate, exacerbating the issues I have highlighted regarding design, scale and orientation.
12. The density of development on this corner plot would also not reflect the open character of other similar corner properties in the immediate area. The cumulative visual impact of both proposed properties would lead to a cramped and over-developed appearance. The use of sympathetic materials would do little to address this impact.

13. I have taken into account that the proposal may include landscaping within the site. However, such a scheme would take considerable time to mature and effectively screen and soften the visual impact of this development. Furthermore, the effectiveness of any landscaping would vary between the seasons and be dependent on future occupants.
14. The proposed development would therefore have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This is contrary to Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan, Spatial Development Strategy for London, 2016 (London Plan) and Policies DH1, H5 and H(c) of the Core Strategy. These require development to have regard to local character and maintain the pattern and grain of existing spaces with particular regard to scale, design and density.

Living Conditions

15. The new detached property would be situated adjacent to the south west rear corner of the proposed semi-detached extension to No 1. The detached dwelling's height, orientation and proximity to the proposed extension would result in a lack of sunlight and overshadowing to the kitchen/diner area and garden of this proposed semi-detached property. This would be exacerbated in the late afternoon and during the winter months.
16. Furthermore, almost the entire length of the side elevation of the detached property would be situated adjacent to the boundary with the new semi-detached property. This would reduce the outlook from the habitable rooms causing a sense of enclosure for future occupants.
17. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the living conditions of the future occupiers of the proposed attached dwelling house, with particular regard to sunlight and outlook. This is contrary to Policy 3.5 of the London Plan, the Mayor of London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (2016) and Policies H5 and DH1 of the Core Strategy. Together these require that development is consistent with the Housing SPD and avoids causing unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, by taking account of layout, orientation and scale.

Other Matters

18. The appellant references the benefits of this proposal, as it would deliver housing stock to the local area. However, this would be extremely limited and does not outweigh the harm I have already identified in relation to the issues of character and appearance and the living conditions of the future occupiers.

Conclusion

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

D Hilton-Brown

INSPECTOR