



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/20/3245542

35A Highcombe, Charlton SE7 7HT

- 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 Siddarth Mahajan against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 19/3147/F, dated 5 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is Erection of a two storey two bedroom detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The address of the site is referred to as Highcombe Road within the appeal submission form, however I have taken the address from the application form submitted to the Council.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the north side of Highcombe at the end of a terrace of six houses immediately adjacent to the two storey end of terrace dwelling of 35 Highcombe. The site area is separate from the adjacent dwelling and sits parallel to the access road to Littlecombe to the rear.
5. The area is characterised by terraced dwellings at Highcombe and Littlecombe, with a pair of semi-detached dwellings flanking the eastern entrance into Highcombe. Roofscapes are also consistent, comprising of pitched roofs with hipped ends to both ends of the terraces on the northern side of Highcombe.
6. A detached dwelling would appear as an anomaly in this location as it would not respect the character of the area. It would jar with the terraced or semi-detached vernacular, appearing as an incongruous feature. Its discordant appearance would be further emphasised as the roof form of pyramid hipped roof would conflict with the prevailing characteristics of the neighbouring roofscape along the terrace to which it would share a close relationship.

7. The omission of unifying elements of chimney stacks and fenestration pattern, and the proposed large projecting central porch would increase its visual intrusion within the street scene as an unsympathetic addition, harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposal would conflict with the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) Policies DH1, H5 and H(c) in their collective aims to achieve high quality design and to maintain the character of the area. Furthermore, it would be contrary to Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 that requires developments to respect the local character and achieve high quality. It would also conflict with the environmental objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework which seek, among other things, to achieve well-designed places.

Other Matters

9. Set against the harm identified there would be limited social and economic benefits associated with the proposal.
10. An additional unit would make little difference to the overall supply of housing in the borough.
11. The Council has raised no concerns in respect of the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of local residents, internal spacing standards or cycle and parking matters, and I find no reason to disagree. However, a finding of no harm is a neutral factor which weighs neither for nor against the proposal.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations which outweigh this finding. For the reasons given I therefore conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR