
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2021

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3259685
377 Rochester Way, Eltham SE9 6PG

- 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 Azat Kaner against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 20/1723/HD, dated 17 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of pillars and front bi-folding gates, brick walls with wood fencing insert panels to side boundaries to the front of house and new 2 metre high brick wall along the side of house down the length of rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. I have adopted that on the decision notice, which was also included on the appeal form as it more fully describes the proposal and determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect that the boundary treatment proposed forward of the front elevation of the dwelling would have on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Rochester Way is a busy route, its character formed of interspersed open spaces and terraced and semi-detached residential properties which despite being set back behind wide pavements and front gardens have a large degree of visibility and prominence.
5. As has been brought to my attention by the appellant, the forward boundary treatment on Rochester Way does exhibit some variation in terms of height, materials and design, in some instances is re-enforced with hedging and there are some examples where it is missing entirely. However, in the main it is very modest in height at around 1m, of simple design and formed of timber or brick.
6. The boundary treatment that is proposed forward of the dwelling would be significantly higher than most of that nearby on Rochester Way and it would

also be more ornate than much of that surrounding by reason of the inclusion of brick pillars to the side boundaries.

7. These differences would be more notable due to the increased width of the property frontage and the positioning of the appeal site immediately to the west of the adjacent finger of open space. The boundary treatment would therefore not be sympathetic to the wider streetscape and would form an uncomfortable feature which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policy DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan (2014) (RGLP) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) which amongst other things require development proposals which are appropriate to local character. I have found no conflict with Policy DH(a) of the RGLP which relates specifically to residential extensions nor have I found the proposal contrary to SPD¹ guidance.

Other Matters

9. I understand that one of the reasons for the height of the boundary treatment proposed is due to security concerns and to enclose a domestic dog which lives outside of the main house. However, while I afford these matters weight I am not convinced that boundary treatment to the front of the house at the height proposed would offer any significant level of security and there is nothing to indicate that the dog could not be safely contained in another manner.
10. In any event, the harm to the character and appearance of the area on what is a busy and well used street would outweigh the limited benefits to the appellant.
11. I also acknowledge the efforts of the appellant in seeking to address previous concerns of the Council by revising the scheme. I acknowledge the presence of a modern and alternative housing development to the west. This is a largely self-contained development with a very different character to Rochester Way more broadly, and a parallel cannot be drawn with this scheme to justify the proposal before me.

Conclusion

12. Taking all relevant matters into account, the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR

¹ Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance December 2018.