
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3248175
46 Woodlands Park Road, London SE10 9XD

- 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 Bal Bahra against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/3813/HD, dated 5 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of 11 Frobisher Road with particular reference to visual impact.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace two-storey dwelling. It is set within a roughly triangular plot, which narrows considerably at the rear. The dwelling's front elevation is set forward of the remainder of the terrace, presumably so that the dwelling could be 'fitted' into the narrowing plot. Development in this area is dense and tightly-knit, reflecting the era in which it was built.
4. A gap is apparent between the property's eastern elevation and the boundary wall separating it from the rear gardens of properties in Frobisher Road. A small part of the gap is currently occupied by the property's single storey entrance, which would be demolished. The intention is to virtually fill the gap with a two-storey extension.
5. Most of the proposal's two-storey side wall would be built very close to the boundary wall separating the appeal site from 11 Frobisher Road. This dwelling too is a terraced property, with a rear protrusion or outrigger. It has a small rear garden, which would be dominated by the proposal, if built. The garden would be increasingly, and unacceptably hemmed-in by the proposal, and the property's occupants would be subjected to an oppressive sense of enclosure when using it. I consider this to be a most un-neighbourly form of development.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of 11 Frobisher Road's residents by reason of its unacceptable and

harmful visual impact upon them. Accordingly, a clear conflict arises with the provisions of policy DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy which seeks to ensure that new development should not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers.

Other matters

7. The appellant has pointed to other instances in the area considered similar to the appeal proposal. To my mind, however, these only serve to exemplify the tightly-knit nature of local development – they do not justify permission being granted to harmful, oppressive development.
8. All other matters raised in the representations have been taken into account, but none raised is of is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.
9. Accordingly, for the reasons provided above, the appeal is dismissed.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR