



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2024

by David Smith BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5TH March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/23/3326736

17 Moordown, Plumstead, SE18 3LY

- 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 W Hylton against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 23/0101/F.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and the construction of a single storey 2 bedrooms, 3 person detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Moordown is within an established residential area. Its notable characteristics include the steep topography and the spectacular distant views over central London. Although there are 3-storey blocks of flats in Cantwell Road, the predominant built typology near the appeal site is short rows of 2-storey terraced houses. These rise and fall to follow the slopes. Development is generally confined to the road frontage in conventional fashion with rear gardens providing a softer foil to the buildings. Outbuildings within these areas are modest in size and visually subservient to the terraces.
4. The proposed dwelling would be sited within the rear portion of the garden of No 17. An existing garage and sheds would be removed and vehicular access is shown to be gained from a back alley behind the properties in Moordown. The single storey building would have a linear form and a hipped roof.
5. Introducing a separate residential unit behind the line of housing would be wholly at odds with the general pattern of development that is a key feature of the surroundings. It represents a piecemeal addition that would bear no relation to the current layout of the locality. The proposal would not be large in itself but would be much greater in size and footprint than the existing outbuildings. As such, it would dominate the rear garden and would have a poor and cramped relationship with the existing dwelling. Although not highly visible from outside the site, the impact on the overriding character of the area would be a significantly negative one.

6. Therefore, the proposal would harm the character of the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policies DH1 and H5 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies of 2014. These expects high quality design to be achieved. As the character of the area would not be maintained, the proposed dwelling would also conflict with Policy H(c) which deals with backland development.

Other Matters

7. Policy H2 of The London Plan indicates that Boroughs should significantly increase the contribution of small sites to meet London's housing needs and sets a ten-year target for Greenwich. However, that policy does not mean that the development of small sites should always be accepted and it specifically refers to supporting well-designed new homes. In its setting, the proposal does not fall into this category. There is no evidence of a dearth of small site opportunities in Greenwich or of a failure to provide an adequate supply of housing land. The provision of an additional home on a windfall site is therefore only of limited weight in favour of the proposal.
8. Planning permission was given at appeal for a dwelling at land to the rear of 67 and 67A Eglington Hill (Ref: APP/E5330/W/21/3269946). However, this does not set a precedent that must be followed in subsequent cases. Indeed, the Council observes that the site is 0.3km away and that the context and characteristics of the two sites are different. There is no information to contradict this and the design of that dwelling is modern rather than traditional. Therefore, that case can be distinguished from this one and it does not justify permitting an unacceptable scheme.
9. There are two significant trees close to the existing garage and the extent that they would be affected is not clear. No assessment has been made of any ecological impacts. Furthermore, from my site inspection, it is not apparent that vehicular access from the private access to the rear is physically possible. Local residents have raised other concerns which were addressed in the officer report. However, as the appeal is to be dismissed, there is no need to consider any of these matters further.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no material considerations that outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal should fail.

David Smith

INSPECTOR