



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2025

by **C Housden BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th of July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/24/3357539

59 Shawbrooke Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 6AL

- 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 Llukovi against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application ref is 24/3248/F.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing side extension and construction of a new two storey dwelling house (Use Class C3) to the side of 59 Shawbrooke Road and associated landscaping and external alterations
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposal differs from the application form to the decision notice. That above has been taken from the decision notice given the appellant has adopted this description in their appeal documentation. I have however removed the word “resubmission” given this is not an act of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue relevant to the appeal is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The area predominantly comprises two-storey dwellings with consistent architectural features arranged as semi-detached properties and in short terraces. Properties are set back from the road with open frontages and are organised in a uniform pattern, following a mostly linear building line. Corner plots at the junctions off Shawbrooke Road and elsewhere nearby predominantly have space adjacent to the side elevation which helps to create an open character and appearance.
5. The appeal site relates to 59 Shawbrooke Road (No 59), a semi-detached property situated in a corner plot. The property has an open gap to the side which contributes to an open character and provides separation to the adjacent pavement from built form. The open gap to the side of No 59 also allows for views to and from Katherine Gardens, including positive views of the central green. No 59 has been subject to a gable extension which is an unusual feature in the streetscene given the majority of the properties have hipped roofs.

6. The introduction of a two-storey dwelling would significantly diminish the positive appearance of the appeal site as an open corner plot. The siting of a dwelling within this gap to the side of the plot would be significantly out of keeping with the established pattern of development where these gaps, and the lack of two-storey development up to the pavement edge are a defined and positive feature. Furthermore, the proposal would harmfully obscure views to and from Katherine Gardens which would be to the detriment of the open appearance of the area. The limited setback off the boundary would be insufficient to mitigate this impact.
7. Whilst the design of the proposed dwelling would be of an architectural style in keeping with the wider area, including the re-introduction of a hipped roof at the appeal site, this would not overcome or otherwise justify the fundamental design concerns that I have identified relating to its siting. The appeal proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. My attention has been drawn to an extension at 73 Shawbrooke Road which was approved by the Council. However, this proposal was for a single storey extension to an existing two storey property, that also retains a perception of a gap above the ground floor level. I therefore cannot draw any direct comparison with the proposal that would weigh in its favour. Whilst reference has been made by the appellant to other corner plots that have been extended, I do not have details of these and in any case, I am required to consider the appeal on its merits.
9. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) (LP), Policies DH1, H5 and H(c) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) (CSDP). These policies, amongst other criteria, seeks to ensure developments are of a high quality that respond to local context and positively contribute to the area. For the same reasons, the proposal would be contrary to Chapter C.1.3 of the Royal Borough Greenwich Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (October 2023) that states that infill developments should be strongly linked to the character of the place, should support the overall cohesion of the townscape and take cues from the surrounding built form.

Other Considerations

10. Whilst the proposal may provide a suitable standard of living conditions for future occupiers, this lack of harm is not a benefit in itself. I therefore attach this neutral weight in my considerations.
11. However, the proposal would add an additional dwelling to the housing stock on an underused site which is located close to services and facilities. This weighs in favour of the proposal.

Planning Balance

12. The proposal is not in accordance with the aforementioned policies of the CSDP and LP, by virtue of the harm to the character and appearance of the area, which would be significant and long lasting. For this reason, the development conflicts with the development plan as a whole.
13. However, the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, with the Council's officer report setting out a position of 2.46 years. The provisions of paragraph 11(d) of the Framework are engaged. Footnote 8 confirms in these

circumstances the policies which are most important for determining the application are considered out-of-date.

14. Paragraph 232 of the Framework confirms due weight should be given to policies, according to their consistency with the Framework.
15. The importance of achieving well-designed development is a key aspect of sustainable development, as set out in section 12 of the Framework, where it is clear at paragraph 139 that development which is not well designed should be refused. Whilst paragraph 124 of the Framework seeks to make effective use of land, this is to be achieved while also safeguarding and improving the environment.
16. Therefore, based on the consistency with the Framework, the conflict between the appeal proposal and Policy D3 of the LP and Policies DH1, H5 and H(c) of the CSDP carries significant weight against the scheme.
17. The Government's objective is to significantly boost the supply of housing, including through small and medium sized schemes on underutilised land that could be built out quickly. The proposal would achieve this and would provide one new dwelling within a built-up area, contributing towards the Council's housing land supply. However, given the small scale of the proposal these benefits would, at most, attract moderate weight.
18. As such, I conclude that the adverse effects of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole. Therefore, in this case, the presumption in favour of sustainable development would not apply.

Conclusion

19. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that for the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Housden

INSPECTOR