



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 27 October 2020

by Mr Martin Allen B.Sc (Hons), M.Sc, M.R.T.P.I

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3248250

1 Scarsbrook Road, Kidbrook, SE3 8AF

- 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 Veselin Marev against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/3821/HD, dated 5 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a "proposed two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effect on (i) the character and appearance of the area and host dwelling, as well as (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 3 Scarsbrook, with particular regard to daylight and sunlight, outlook, privacy and sense of enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is located within a residential street comprising predominantly semi-detached pairs and terraces of properties, set back from the highway behind front gardens and parking areas. The design and layout of the properties creates a sense of rhythm and regularity within the streetscene, with the scale and proportion of existing dwellings clearly discernible.
4. The proposed two storey extension would continue the ridgeline of the existing semi-detached pair and would end with a hipped roof replicating the form of the existing terrace. However, the lack of any step in the roofline or the front elevation would highlight the extension as a non-subservient addition, disrupting the rhythm of the pair. The fenestration pattern would also be at odds with that of the host property, further highlighting its incongruity. As a result, the extension would appear as an overly prominent addition which would be at odds with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
5. In regard to the single storey extension, whilst it would span the entire width of the extended property, it would not visually have an excessive depth and it would be set down from the first-floor windows. Thus, it would exhibit elements

of subservience. As such, when considered in isolation I find that it would not be visually unacceptable. Nonetheless, it would rely on the side extension which I find above would be harmful.

6. Accordingly, the appeal scheme would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and host dwelling, in conflict with policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014) (the Core Strategy), as well as policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan. Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure development delivers a high quality of design, that extensions to properties should be of a scale and design appropriate to the building and that buildings should comprise details that complement local character. The scheme would also conflict with the guidance of the Royal Borough of Greenwich: Residential Extension, Basements and Conversions Guidance – Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD).

Living conditions

7. The rear single storey extension would be located directly alongside the boundary shared with the neighbouring property, 3 Scarsbrook (No 3). There was a rear facing window to No 3, close to the shared boundary, notwithstanding that the submitted plans show this to be a door. As a result of the proximity of the extension and its height, which is exacerbated by the use of parapet walls, as well as the orientation of the properties with the appeal site to the south of No 3, the extension would result in the loss of both daylight and sunlight to the rear facing window of No 3, diminishing the living conditions of occupiers to an unacceptable degree.
8. Given that the rear extension would be located close to the shared boundary with No 3, I am conscious that it would result in a new built element, which at its maximum height as stated by the Council of 4.2 metres (m) would be a significant and dominant form of development in close proximity to rear facing windows and the outdoor space of No 3. In this respect, it would impinge on the outlook from the property, as well as resulting in an unacceptable sense of enclosure for occupiers when utilising the outdoor space nearest to the rear of No 3.
9. In addition to the rear extension, decking is also shown which it is stated would be 0.7m above ground level. This would allow for overlooking into the rear facing windows of No 3, into the internal living space. I acknowledge the point that screening could be introduced to limit any such overlooking, however this would have the effect of further exacerbating the loss of outlook and sense of enclosure that I have found above and thus would not be an acceptable method of mitigating the overlooking.
10. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 3 Scarsbrook, with particular regard to daylight and sunlight, outlook, privacy and sense of enclosure. Thus, it would conflict with policy DH(b) of the Core Strategy and policy 7.6 of the London Plan, insofar as they seek to ensure extensions do not result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers and development does not cause unacceptable harm to amenity. The proposal would also conflict with the guidance of the SPD.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has cited a number of examples of other developments as precedents, which it is contended are similar to the appeal scheme. From the limited details provided, it is clear that a number of these have included a step in both elevation and roof and one includes bay windows which break up the front elevation. These are therefore clearly distinguishable from the appeal scheme. I am particularly conscious that one of the cited examples does appear to be similar in form to the appeal scheme, however I do not have details of the circumstances which led to its construction. Nonetheless, it does not convince me that the proposal would be acceptably designed. In any event, I have nothing before me to suggest that the cited examples are comparable in terms of the proposed rear extension with which I have found harm. The provided examples do not therefore dissuade me from my findings above.

Conclusion

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

Mr Martin Allen

INSPECTOR