

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2020

by Andre Pinto BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3245296

3 Burrage Place, Plumstead SE18 7BG

- 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 Howard Prosser against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 19/2761/HD, dated 5 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing rear extension and construction of a part one, part two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Issues

2. I observed in my site visit that the development has already commenced. Nevertheless I have made my decision based on the information and evidence provided with the application Ref 19/2761/HD.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of occupiers of nearby properties, with particular regard to loss of outlook and loss of daylight.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential area and it is part of a terrace of properties which occupies most of Burrage Place. The properties along the terrace share a common building line and are of a similar height and bulk.
5. The proposal is for the construction of a part one, part two storey rear extension. The top floor of the proposed extension, according to Drawing 003.B (2018), would extend approximately 3.6 metres from the original rear wall and would accommodate a bedroom and a bathroom.
6. Although it is agreed between the parties that the proposed extension, at ground floor level, is not likely to have an adverse effect on the living condition of the occupants of nearby properties, at first floor, the Council has raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposal.

7. The main concern and point of dispute between the parties is with regard to the impact of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of nearby properties, particularly due to the proximity of the proposed development to a window at the first floor rear elevation of 4 Burrage Place.
8. Policy DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) (the Core Strategy) states that new development is required to demonstrate that it would not lead to a significant loss of amenity to adjacent or nearby properties, including daylight and outlook.
9. Evidence has been submitted which demonstrates that the proposed rear extension would, in fact, be erected at close proximity to the boundary with No 4 and although the proposed extension would not overhang unduly from the rear elevation of the appeal site, due to its height, size and overall design, the proposal would likely be easily perceived from the neighbouring property.
10. Consequently, the proposed development would likely impact on the outlook enjoyed by the occupiers of No 4, particularly at first floor level.
11. No evidence has been submitted by the appellant, such as a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment, to demonstrate how the proposed development will not cause a significant effect to the living conditions of nearby residents. Furthermore, the Appellant's Grounds of Appeal Statement (undated) does not provide clear evidence that such an assessment has been carried out or how such a potential impact has been considered as part of the development proposal.
12. I therefore conclude that that the proposal would likely cause harm to the living conditions of occupants of nearby properties, particularly the occupants of 4 Burrage Place, in regard to daylight and outlook. Consequently, the proposal would be in contrary to Policy DH(b) of the Core Strategy, Policy 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) which aims to ensure that buildings and structures do not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding buildings and the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance SPD (2018).

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andre Pinto

INSPECTOR