



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2021

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12.04.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/23/3324717

Land Adjacent to 35 Highcombe, Charlton, Greenwich 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 Tulip Properties and Real Estate Ltd against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0860/F, dated 8 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2023.
 - The development is a two storey house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. This appeal relates to a development that has been implemented, therefore the application is retrospective, and I have determined the scheme accordingly.
3. Subsequent to the decision made by the Council, the National Planning Policy Framework has been revised. Consequently, I have made my decision with regard to the National Planning Framework (December 2023) (the Framework).
4. Also subsequent to the decision made by the Council, the Council adopted the Royal Borough of Greenwich Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2023) (the SPD). This replaces the Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018). I consider that there have been no major changes relevant to the main issue in this appeal and I have therefore had regard to the adopted SPD in making my decision.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

6. The development is a two storey end of terrace house with a hipped roof form. It aligns with the front and rear building lines of the terrace to which it is attached and appears to be the same width as the other houses in the terrace.
7. The local area is made up of similarly scaled terraced housing of differing age and design. The terraces as a whole have pitched roof forms, with end of terrace houses having a mixture of gable and hipped ends. Whilst the

development reflects the scale and proportions of the other terraced houses in the street, its fully hipped pyramid roof form stands in contrast to the established roof forms of the terraces in the street.

8. I note that in 2019 planning permission¹ was given for an end of terrace house with a roof that would continue the pitched roof form of the terrace and would replicate the hipped roof end of 35 Highcombe, to which it would be attached. In 2019 a planning appeal² was dismissed, following the refusal of an application³ for a detached house on the appeal site that would have a fully hipped roof form. The inspector in this appeal made reference, amongst other matters, to the fully hipped pyramid roof form of the proposal in their reasons for dismissing the appeal.
9. By not reflecting the roof form of the terrace to which it is attached and through the omission of the characteristic chimney stacks found on houses in the local area, I find that the development appears as a discordant addition to the terrace in street views from both Highcombe and the cul-de sac at Littlecombe. In these views, it is evident that the fully hipped pyramid roof form of the development does not reflect the established character and appearance of the streetscene, that I have identified above, and consequently appears as an unduly prominent and incongruous addition to the local area.
10. The effect of the development that I have identified above is further exacerbated by the large porch structure and fenestration pattern of the development, which also fail to reflect the design of the other properties in the terrace and appear as discordant features within the streetscene.
11. For these reasons, I find that the development results in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the local area. This does not accord with the design guidance set out in the SPD and conflicts with Policies DH1 and H5 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014) (the Local Plan), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) (the London Plan) and Paragraphs 135 and 139 of the Framework. These collectively seek to ensure that development demonstrates high quality design, responds to site context and integrates with the local area.
12. Although the Council's decision makes reference to Policy D4 of the London Plan, I find that this policy relates to the development of design policy and management by London Planning Authorities and is not applicable in this instance.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

13. According to the Housing Delivery Results 2022 the delivery of new dwellings in the Council area are significantly below the required level. The development results in the public benefit of 1 new medium sized dwelling with its own garden, which would be suitable for a small to medium household. Whilst a single dwelling is a small contribution to the housing shortage, such windfall developments do collectively make a significant contribution to new housing in London.

¹ Planning Ref: 19/2916/F

² Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/W/3245542

³ Planning Ref: 19/3147/F

14. However, with paragraph 11 of the Framework in mind, I find that the substantial adverse impacts of the development, on the character and appearance of the local area, demonstrably and significantly outweigh the benefits. Consequently, the appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR