
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2016

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/16/3159932

114 Well Hall Road, London SE9 6SL

- 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 Mariusz Wisniewski against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 16/1352/F, dated 28 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension to a dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension to a dwelling house at 114 Well Hall Road, London SE9 6SL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/1352/F, dated 28 April 2016, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Preliminary matter

2. The Council had requested that I assess the effects of the proposal from within the neighbouring properties at 112 & 116 Well Hall Road. I was not allowed access into No 112, whilst I assessed the proposal from within No 116's curtilage. I am satisfied that I saw enough to enable me to proceed to my determination.

Main issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on: (a) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and (b) on the living conditions of the residents of 112 & 116 Well Hall Road with particular reference to sunlight; outlook and visual impact.

Reasons

Character & appearance

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling. It already displays a rear, single storey protrusion, occupying the full width of the property. Part of the protrusion has a pitched roof, with the remainder, towards the garden, being flat roofed. The protrusion is built virtually on the common boundary shared with the adjoining dwelling, 116 Well Hall Road.
 5. Because the existing rear protrusion is in such a poor state of repair, the appellant intends demolishing it and replacing it with a flat roofed rear extension. This would not occupy the entire width of the property, but would
-

nevertheless be built, as now, virtually along the garden boundary shared with No 116. It would project further into the garden than the existing structure, excessively so in the Council's view. It would also be higher than the flat roof element of the extant protrusion, but lower than much of the pitched roof element.

6. The original character of the property has already been altered significantly by the nature of the existing addition at the rear. Given the variation in its roof profile, it is not a particularly attractive structure. Accordingly, whilst I understand the Council's concern, the replacement extension would not make matters materially worse in this regard.
7. Moreover, the extension would be well screened by existing structures and would not be noticeable in the public realm. Since high fences screen the extension from most local gardens in the locality, views of the proposed development, other than those available from No 116, would be largely restricted to the first floor windows of adjacent dwellings. However, given the presence and visual impact of the extant protrusion, I do not consider that the proposal would cause additional harm to the visual amenities of the locality.
8. I conclude that the proposed development, taking into account that which would be replaced, would sit acceptably in its visual and spatial contexts without harming the integrity of the host property or the surrounding area. Accordingly, no material conflict arises with those requirements of policies DH1 & DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (CS) that provide in combination that development proposals, particularly house extensions, should be of a high quality of design and of a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality.

Living conditions

9. Since 112 Well Hall Road is located to the north of the appeal property, its residents would not be affected by loss of sunlight, and nor does the Council suggest otherwise. No 112 is physically separate from the appeal property, situated at a slightly higher level, and the respective curtilages are divided at the rear by a high timber fence. The proposed extension would be sited further away from No 112 than the existing protrusion. Taking all these factors into account, and notwithstanding the increase in length and height of the flat roofed element proposed compared with the existing protrusion, I do not consider that the residents of No 112 would be subjected to a material loss of outlook, and nor could they reasonably perceive themselves as being unduly enclosed.
10. My visit took place just before noon on a sunny day, and the pitched roof element of the extant protrusion was casting a full shadow on No 116's rear ground floor glazed openings. Since the roof level would be lowered at this point, the proposed extension would present some benefits in that there would be less overshadowing, and less visual impact, at a point closest to the adjoining house.
11. A high fence exists beyond the extant protrusion along the common boundary between Nos. 114 & 116. The new extension would be higher than this fence, and part would be plainly seen above it. However, given the generous length and width of No 116's garden and the presence of the fence, I do not consider

that the increased height would result in the extension appearing oppressively dominant, and nor would it materially affect outlook.

12. I therefore conclude, on balance, that the development would not harm neighbouring living conditions by reason of loss of sunlight, outlook or visual impact. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with those provisions of CS policy DH(b) designed to protect the amenities of adjacent occupiers.

Conditions

13. The Council's has suggested a condition requiring that the materials used in the construction shall match those of the existing building. The existing building, however, is brick built whilst the appellant intends to coat the extension with a render finish. I have noted the Council's comments regarding the proposed render finish, and its colour. To my mind, however, the use of render would not be unacceptable, nor is the use of grey, depending on its precise shade. A light rather than a dark shade would have advantages, particularly in making the surface more reflective and lighter on the eye of those closest to it. A condition shall therefore be imposed, in the interests of amenity, requiring further details of the proposed render finish.
14. It is also necessary in the interests of certainty that the development is built in accordance with the approved plans, and a condition to this effect is imposed.

Other matters

15. Reference has been made to other development plan policies, but those to which I have referred are considered the most relevant, taking account of the thrust of the Council's reasons for refusal.
16. Reference has been made to the document entitled 'Planning Guidance for Home Extensions', published in 2004. However, the Council has recently adopted new guidance entitled 'Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance - Supplementary Planning Document', based largely on policies contained within the CS. The content of both documents has been taken into account, in particular that aspect of the guidance relating to the preferred lengths of rear single storey extensions.
17. All other matters raised in the representations have also been taken into account, including the references made to the *National Planning Policy Framework*, but no other matter is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. No development shall begin until details of the the precise colour of the render finish to the extension, hereby permitted, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development

shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and the finished colour of the extension shall not be varied in future without the local planning authority's prior written consent.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 113-D00, D01 Rev 02, D02 Rev 02, D03 Rev 03, D04 Rev 03, D05 Rev 02, D06 Rev 02, D07 Rev 03, D08 Rec 02, D09 Rev 02 and D10 Rev 02.