



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2021
by C Rafferty LLB (Hons), Solicitor

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/21/3270216

Land rear of 66 and 68 Parkview Road, New Eltham SE9 3QW

- 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 Shaun Collins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 20/2044/F, dated 27 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 2 bed bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The address has been taken from the appeal form and decision notice, which based on the plans appears more accurate than that in the application form.
4. Since the Council made its decision the 2021 London Plan has been adopted and supersedes the 2016 London Plan. Although the main parties refer to policies in the 2021 London Plan in their submissions, I have not been provided with copies of these policies and as such they have not been determinative in my recommendation.
5. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Accordingly, and in light of the reference made to the previous iteration of the Framework within the submitted evidence, the parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. In this respect, I am mindful that neither the appellant nor the Council have made any further submissions regarding the revised Framework. However, in light of this re-consultation, I am satisfied that any references made to the revised Framework within this decision would not be unreasonable to the parties.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal site comprises a section of the rear gardens of No 66 and 68 Parkview Road. The surrounding area is residential in nature with a range of property styles and development, including infill development and outbuildings, and a variety of landscaping treatments such as trees and hedging. While plot shapes vary, rear gardens are primarily sizeable and deep spaces. In particular Nos 66 – 68 form part of a group of dwellings with a shared characteristic in their long, narrow gardens which provide a sense of openness and verdant space to the rear. No 64 is located immediately to the west of the appeal site, comprising a bungalow with associated garage, in a relatively shallow but wide plot.
8. The proposal would introduce a contemporary styled two bed dormer bungalow. Given the varied character of the area and its location alongside No 64, it would not appear out of place from a design perspective. Nonetheless, it would require the subdivision of the plots at Nos 66 and 68. This would significantly reduce the rear garden space at these dwellings to create the appeal site.
9. While the retained gardens at Nos 66 and 68 would be acceptable with regards to amenity space provision, they would result in notably smaller plots at odds with the predominantly spacious plots of properties fronting Parkview Road. The long rear gardens, characteristic of the group of dwellings within which these properties sit, would be significantly diminished. The reduced scale of the plots would therefore not respect the surrounding development pattern and would be uncharacteristic in this area.
10. Compared with the spacious plots in the area, the resulting appeal site would also appear constrained. The built form of the proposed dwelling would dominate the space and, when combined with the car parking provision and proposed bin store, would result in a cramped appearance. This would create a sense of overdevelopment which would be heightened by the modest garden areas, which although compliant with local policy would be in stark contrast with the larger outside spaces of most neighbouring properties. As a result, it would not have the sense of openness characteristic of this area.
11. The appellant's evidence suggests the proposal would result in the loss of one tree on the appeal site, however their tree report suggests more would need to be removed. This would invariably alter the appearance of the site, however the trees are small and as such have a very localised visual impact. There are a variety of landscaping approaches in the area, with gardens benefiting from different levels of planting. Even accounting for the discrepancy in the number of trees to be removed, the visual impact of their loss would not be so great as to significantly harm the character and appearance of the site or its contribution to the surrounding area. I also note the willingness of the appellant to securing further planting by condition, although no planting scheme has been submitted.
12. I acknowledge that the proposal would be situated alongside the tandem development of No 64. However, this remains a more spacious plot than the appeal site, with its modest proportions offset by the sense of openness and verdant space created by the current long rear gardens at Nos 66 and 68. Introducing the proposal at this location would erode this sense, highlighting the overdeveloped nature of the site and creating an uncharacteristically built-up feel around this corner of the access road, which would not respect the overall pattern of

development. Overall, the proposal would appear as an awkward and contrived addition in this location.

13. Therefore, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would fail to accord with Policies H(c), H5 and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) which together seek to promote good design. These policies are consistent with the design policies of the Framework and as such I afford the conflict with them very substantial weight.

Other Matters

14. The proposal would provide a dwelling on a small site and living accommodation that would comply with Nationally Described Space Standards, as supported by the Framework. However, while the contribution of every dwelling to boosting housing supply is valuable, the benefits of one dwelling carry limited weight. The appellant suggests the proposal would improve the security of Nos 66 and 68, however it has not been demonstrated that this could not be achieved by other means. As such, this carries negligible weight. Consequently, the benefits of the proposal are not sufficient to outweigh the harm identified above.
15. The proposal would provide sufficient parking space for a dwelling of this size. Similarly, given the location of the proposal in relation to neighbours, there would be no unreasonable loss of privacy or increase in noise to neighbouring occupiers. Therefore, it would comply with some other development plan policies. However, the lack of harm in these respects does not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

C Rafferty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR