



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2024

by N Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/23/3320950

77 Moordown, Plumstead, Greenwich SE18 3NA

- 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 Imre Kovacs against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/4305/F, dated 23 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a two storey, two-bedroom residential property to the side of No.77 Moordown with associated landscaping works and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary

2. Revised versions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for the appeal. I have had regard to the latest version of the Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues raised by this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the occupiers of No.77 Moordown.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The surrounding area comprises terraces or pairs of semi-detached properties with open space interspersed between them. These open spaces provide an openness to the character and appearance of this residential area. These spaces make a significant contribution to the pleasant appearance of the area. The existing side garden contributes to the open space within the vicinity. Placing built form in this space would diminish the openness of the area.
5. The dwelling, being detached, would be an uncharacteristic feature of the area. Whilst the proposed dwelling would match the front building line of No.77 Moordown it would sit significantly forward of the front building line of the

adjacent dwelling at No.79 Moordown and the terrace of which it forms part. By siting the proposed dwelling substantially forward of No.79 the proposed dwelling would be a clearly visible and prominent development within the Moordown street scene. Its positioning would have an awkward siting and visual relationship with No.79. This relationship, along with its uncharacteristic detached form, would be out of keeping in this street scene.

6. The appellant points to there being examples of detached houses all around the UK. Nonetheless, in making an assessment of the acceptability of a detached dwelling at the appeal site, consideration can and should be given to the character and prevailing form of the dwellings within the immediate surrounding area, which in this case are terrace and semi-detached dwellings. Whilst it is argued that the roof form has been designed to match the surrounding area, its hipped roof design would be out of keeping with the existing roof forms of existing dwellings.
7. The proposal would place built development within an existing open space that contributes to the open character and appearance of the Moordown street scene. Placing built development at this site would diminish the pleasant openness of the area. Furthermore, the siting, form and design of the proposed dwelling would not integrate successfully within the Moordown street scene. Consequently, the proposal would be an unsympathetic development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the locality.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan, Policies DH1, H5 and H(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies and the provision of the Framework. These policies seek, amongst other matters, development to be of high quality design, to create an integrated environment, to positively contribute to the improvements of both built and natural environments and to respond to the existing character of a place.

Living conditions

9. The occupiers of neighbouring properties should reasonably expect to enjoy an acceptable outlook as part of their residential lives. One of the side windows within No.77 serves a habitable internal living space. The proposed development would not extend beyond the front and rear building lines of No. 77. Notwithstanding this, given the overall size of the proposed dwelling at its close proximity to and orientation with No.77, the dwelling would be extremely dominant in the outlook from the side habitable living space within this neighbouring properties. It would create overshadowing of No.77 reducing both daylight and sunlight to habitable rooms relating to this property. A dwelling in such close proximity to the adjoining property would diminish the enjoyment of the residential living environment for the neighbouring occupiers and would harm the enjoyment the existing occupiers should reasonably expect to enjoy.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No.77 Moordown. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policy DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies. That policy seeks, amongst other matters, new development to demonstrate that there would be no significant

loss of amenity to adjacent or nearby properties, by reducing the amount of daylight, sunlight or outlook they enjoy.

Planning Balance

11. The Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply of deliverable housing sites. As such, the provisions of paragraph 11d) of the Framework should be applied.
12. The proposal would boost the supply of housing and could provide a high quality family home. However, even if the housing shortfall is substantial, the benefits associated with a single dwelling would be small. Also any economic benefits during construction would be temporary and limited.
13. The adverse impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the occupiers of No.77 Moor down attracts substantial weight and therefore significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework when taken as a whole. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

14. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR