



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2019

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/19/3226543

9a Dupree Road, Charlton, London, SE7 7RR.

- 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 Ms Elaine Bowtell against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 18/4359/F, dated 20 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as construction of a single storey rear infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 7 Dupree Road (No.7) with particular regard to outlook, sunlight and daylight.

Reasons

3. Dupree Road is characterised by traditionally designed older two storey dwellings, some of which were designed as pairs of maisonettes. To the rear the dwellings have attached two storey, pitched roof projections, which create narrow paved areas to the side of them. Some of these passages have been infilled with single storey extensions. The appeal building comprises a pair of modest sized maisonettes, with a narrow paved area on the northern side of the rear projecting wing.
4. Other than the retention of a lightwell to the rear of the existing ground floor bedroom, the proposed extension would fill the existing open gap between the side wall of the rear projecting wing and the adjacent boundary fence with No.7. It's mono-pitched roof would be hipped away from No.7 and the proposed extension would have an eaves height of approximately 2.8 metres. However, the eaves height would be higher when viewed from No.7 as that property sits at a lower level to the appeal property.
5. The ground floor maisonette at No.7 has a rear east facing habitable room window which looks into the adjacent passage and rear garden of that property. With the proposal, due to its height, the proposed extension would have an enclosing impact on this outlook, which would be visually overbearing.

At the same time, it would result in some loss of daylight/sunlight, which would exacerbate its overbearing visual impact.

6. Within the south elevation of the maisonette at No.7 there is a similar window and the outlook from the room it serves would be directly towards the proposed lightwell. Whilst the proposed extension would be apparent in peripheral views and would result in some loss of daylight/sunlight, in itself this would not amount to a reason for dismissing this appeal. However, it adds to my concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the outlook from the rear facing window.
7. There is another window and a door in the south elevation of No.7 which would face directly towards the proposed extension. However, the door is not glazed and the window is small, with a limited outlook. As a consequence, the impact of the proposed extension on this window and door would not have a materially adverse impact on the rooms they serve. In addition, although the proposed extension would have an enclosing impact on the narrow garden area to the south of the rear projecting wing at No.7, it would not have a material impact on the main garden area to the rear of that dwelling. At the same time, the proposed extension has been designed to respect and blend in appropriately with the host property. As a result, the proposed extension would not have an unacceptable impact on the rear garden environment.
8. There is no doubt that the proposed extension would materially enhance the living environment within the appeal dwelling, as well as providing an enhanced outlook into the rear garden of that property. However, these benefits would fail to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the living conditions of the occupiers of the ground floor maisonette at No.7, due solely to the height of the proposed extension.
9. For this reason, I conclude that the proposed extension would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.7. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies DH1 and DH(b) of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with detailed policies 2014, the Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and conversions Guidance – Supplementary Planning Document 2018 and Policy 7.6 of The London Plan. Together and amongst other things they seek to ensure that extensions do not have an overbearing impact on the outlook from the principal windows and gardens of neighbouring properties, or result in an unacceptable loss of daylight or sunlight for the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR