

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2016

by J A B Gresty MA MRICS

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

Decision date: 17 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/16/3157943

6 Southland Road, Plumstead, London SE18 2BB

- 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 Miss Kassandra Bacon against the decision of the Council for the Royal London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 16/1290/F, dated 22 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a side extension and first floor extension with velux window at the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area and whether the development would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties with respect to outlook and loss of light.

Reasons

Living Conditions

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, mid-terrace house. The proposal is for construction of a first-floor, flat-roofed extension over the existing single-storey rear projection of the house with a two-storey rear extension which would provide for a new stairwell to the first floor of the house. The stairwell extension would project a couple of metres or so from the back wall of the two-storey house and its side wall would stand on the boundary with 7 Southland Road's narrow back yard. Because of its height, the side wall of the stairwell extension would be very prominent when viewed from No 7's adjacent ground floor window and back yard. Whilst the stairwell extension would be to the north, because of its height and close proximity to No 7, it would lead to some loss of natural daylight to No 7's back yard and window. Overall, the stairwell extension would be an unduly tall and prominent feature when viewed from No 7 and would result in an undue sense of enclosure when viewed from No 7's back yard and adjacent ground floor window, to the extent that it would detract from the living conditions of the occupiers of No 7, contrary to the
-

requirements of Policy DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (CS) and paragraph 5.24 of the Royal Borough of Greenwich residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document.

4. The first floor extension over the existing single-storey projection would be separated from No 7 by the width of the appeal property's back yard. Consequently, it would not be unduly prominent when viewed from No 7 or have a significant effect on the amount of natural daylight No 7 receives. In this respect the extension would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 7.
5. The first floor extension would have a small window which would face towards No 7 and which could lead to a loss of privacy for the occupiers of No 7. However, this matter could be overcome by imposition of a condition to obscure glaze the window and would not be reason to dismiss the appeal.
6. To the north, No 5 has a similar scale single-storey rear projection which adjoins the appeal property's rear projection. No 5's rear projection would restrict views of the proposed first-floor extension from No 5's back yard and the extension would be over two metres from No 5's first floor window. Because of the distance between the proposed extension and No 5's first floor window, it would not be unduly prominent when viewed from No 5 or result in significant loss of light to No 5's window and back yard. In these respects the proposed development would not have a significant effect the living conditions of the occupiers of No 5.

Character and Appearance

7. Cumulatively the proposed extensions would be prominent additions to the host building. However, the flat-roofs of the extensions would not project above the eaves of the two-storey house and, taking into account that appeal property has a good sized back garden, the development would be in keeping with the scale of the host property.
8. Other dwellings nearby in the row of houses have two-storey rear projections of similar depth to that of the appeal property and No 8 has a single-storey projection with a tall mono-pitch roof which, as a consequence of the slope of the land, would appear to be nearly as tall as the proposed extensions would be when viewed from the appeal property's garden. Overall the proposed extensions would be in keeping with the existing scale and pattern of development to the rear of the terrace of houses and would be subservient to the appeal property as a whole. In these respects the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the local area and would accord with the design aims of CS Policies DH1 and DH(a) and London Plan Policy 7.4.

Conclusion

9. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and it should make places better for people. Although the design of the proposed development would be keeping with the character and appearance of the local area, the two-storey stairwell extension

would adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of No 7, contrary to the aims of the Framework. Therefore, the proposed development would not represent sustainable development as sought by the Framework and, on balance and for the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J A B Gresty

INSPECTOR