



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2024

**by S Pearce BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 11 June 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/23/3334971**

**117 Garland Road, Greenwich, Plumstead SE18 2PL**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Amarjeet Singh against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
  - The application Ref is 23/2898/F.
  - The development proposed is described as "the demolition of existing detached garage and the erection of a double storey detached dwelling consisting of 2 bedroom, 3 persons single family dwelling at the rear of 117 Garland Road, SE18 fronting Landstead Road."
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matter

2. Since the determination of this application, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 19 December 2023 and updated on 20 December 2023. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I consider that there is no requirement for me to seek further submissions on the Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests would be prejudiced by my taking this approach.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within a predominately residential area and comprises part of the rear garden serving 117 Garland Road. The built form in the area primarily comprises a mix of two storey terraced and semi-detached properties, that have pitched roofs with central ridges and broadly consistent building lines along Garland Road and Landstead Road. While plot sizes within the area differ, properties are typically sited in narrow plots, with front and rear gardens. The rear gardens serving corner plots, including that associated with No 117, form an open break in otherwise largely built-up frontages. It is the layout, spacious corner plots and pitched roofs that contribute to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Due to the corner position of No 117, the appeal property would be sited with its frontage facing onto Landstead Road, adjacent to 1 Landstead Road. While

the proposed property would be broadly in line with the garage it is to replace, it would, nevertheless, be closer to the highway than the frontage of No 1 and the built form along Lanstead Road. The appeal site comprises a wide plot, with a shallow depth. As such, the proposed layout would result in a property located close to the rear boundary of the appeal site, with no rear garden, a shallow frontage and narrow side garden. Moreover, the location and size of the appeal site would also erode the depth of the rear garden of No 117 and, in turn, the spaciousness of this corner plot. Consequently, the proposed layout would result in an incongruous form of development, at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of the area.

6. The design of the proposed property incorporates two crown roofs. While noting that the adjacent property, No 1, benefits from a single crown roof, this is an isolated feature in the area. Furthermore, the proposed roof design would be a particularly prominent feature due to the appeal scheme's proximity to Lanstead Road. As such, the roof form of the appeal scheme would be an incongruous feature, at odds with the prevailing roof forms of the surrounding built form.
7. For the above reasons, the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan March 2021, Policies H(c) and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies July 2014 (CS) and the Royal Borough of Greenwich Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2023. Collectively, these seek, among other things, to ensure development proposals positively respond to local distinctiveness, deliver good design and maintain the character of the area. It is also contrary to the Framework which seeks, among other things, to ensure development is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.
8. The Council have referred to CS Policy DH(a) within their reason for refusal. This policy relates to residential extensions. As the appeal proposal seeks the erection of a detached dwelling, this policy is not relevant to the main issue.

### **Other Matters**

9. The appellant contends that the remaining garden to No 117 would be sufficient for existing occupiers and that the proposed materials would match neighbouring properties. Furthermore, they assert that there would be no loss of privacy or increase in noise or disturbance for neighbouring occupiers as a result of the proposal and no significant loss of wildlife habitats, including trees or shrubs. These aspects are neutral matters in the planning balance.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the Framework, that indicate I should conclude other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*S Pearce*

INSPECTOR