



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2024

by M Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/24/3341967

61 Moordown, Plumstead, Greenwich SE18 3NA

- 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 Dr. Kalaharajah against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 23/3448/F.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "erection of one 3 bedroom attached dwelling."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a rectangular area of land which forms part of the garden to the side of 61 Moordown. The host property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling which is elevated from the road and is situated on a corner plot at the roundabout junction with Downend, an adjoining residential cul-de-sac. The property includes a small single storey extension to the side with a roof terrace above. The site is enclosed by walls and hedges and there is a gated vehicle access and a domestic garage to the rear.
4. The area is characterised by semi-detached and terraced two storey dwellings which are set back from the road behind low walls and front gardens. Properties generally follow the sloping topography and curving roads. Though some have been extended, there remains a sense of uniformity to the area due to the similar design of properties, featuring bay windows, hipped roofs, front gables and materials comprising brick, render and tiled roofs.
5. The street scene has a spacious character due to the gaps between properties and areas of green open space. The side garden of No 61 forms part of a visual break in the street scene and provides an open feel which contributes to the spacious character of the area.
6. The appeal proposal is a revised scheme comprising a proposed end terraced dwelling to the side of No 61. The latter would become a mid terraced dwelling between the new dwelling and 9 Condoover Crescent on the other side. The roof of the dwelling would follow the eaves and ridge height of No 61. In

design, it would broadly reflect neighbouring properties, particularly in respect of proportions, height, fenestration and external materials.

7. Although the proposed gable end would not reflect the existing hipped roof of No 61 or the roof scape character of the area in general, it would match the gable end at No 9. The scale of the proposed rear dormer would not accord with the guidance relating to dormer extensions contained in the Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). However, there are similar dormers elsewhere in the area and the proposed dormer would mirror the appearance of the dormer at No 9, albeit on a smaller scale. Consequently, the proposed gable end and dormer would provide symmetry to the short terrace. That said, the proposed roof form would emphasize the substantial scale and massing of the dwelling and increase its dominance.
8. It would largely infill the garden to the side of No 61 and would step well forward of the properties to the rear at 1-3 Downend. Although there are garages which project forward of the properties to the rear on Downend, these are relatively small, single storey structures which do not have as significant a presence as the proposal would. Whilst there is not a uniform building line on Downend, the side elevation of No 61 is broadly in line with the front of Nos 1-3, which results in a harmonious relationship between these properties. The significant breach in the building line of Nos 1-3 would be readily apparent due to the elevated position of the properties on Downend, and would fail to respect the prevailing pattern of development in the area.
9. Moreover, the position of the proposal on an elevated corner plot would result in a highly prominent addition to the street scene. Whilst the proposal would maintain a gap of around 2m from the side boundary, the significant reduction in the width of the gap and proximity to the side boundary, would lead to an unacceptable sense of enclosure and a cramped appearance at odds with the open and spacious character of the area.
10. I have had regard to the side extension at 73 Moordown. However, it is a more modest and recessive addition, with a larger gap to the side boundary and is angled away from the road. Whilst that development extends beyond the building line of 2-4 Downend, the latter are recessed much further from the road than the properties on the northern side of Downend and are not as visible from Moordown. Therefore, the breach of the building line on that side of Downend is not as obvious in the street scene as would be the case with the appeal proposal. My attention has also been drawn to a recently dismissed appeal for a dwelling to the side of 77 Moordown¹. However, the design of that proposal and its surrounding context are not identical to the proposal before me. Therefore, these other developments are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal which I have assessed on its own merits.
11. I conclude that, notwithstanding the revisions to the scheme, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan, Policies DH1, H5 and H(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, and the SPD. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development is of high quality design that provides a positive relationship between the proposed and existing urban context. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) where this requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

¹ Appeal ref. APP/E5330/W/3320950

Other Matters

12. I note the other concerns raised by interested parties. However, as the appeal is to be dismissed for other reasons, these other matters would not affect the outcome of the appeal and I have not considered them further.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

13. The Council is unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The current supply stands at 2.8 years which represents a significant shortfall and means that Framework paragraph 11(d) is engaged. In these circumstances, permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
14. The development would offer benefits in terms of providing a new dwelling to the Council's housing supply, which would align with the support given by the Framework for the development of windfall sites and its objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. Employment opportunities would be created during the construction phase of the development and future occupiers would provide on-going support for local services. I attach only limited weight to these benefits given that the proposal is one new dwelling.
15. I attribute significant weight to the harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the adverse impacts of allowing the appeal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.
16. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR