



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2020

by Rebecca Thomas MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3244915
25 Riefeld Road, London SE9 2QD

- 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 E Sisman against the decision of the Council of the Royal London Borough of Greenwich.
The application Ref 19/3240/HD, dated 18 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is Part 1 single storey/part 2 two storey side addition, single storey rear addition, internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the appeal and application forms, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises "*Construction of a single storey rear and first floor side extension and new front canopy*". The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I .

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - i) the character and appearance of surrounding area and;
 - ii) living conditions of the occupants of no. 23 and no.27 Riefeld Road, with particular reference to daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site at number 25 is a semi-detached property located on a residential street. The existing property has a canopied ground floor with a bay window and hipped gable feature to the front. The layout is similar to the attached property at number 23. There is a small garage with a covered link and the pair of dwellings feature a hipped gable roof.
5. Dwellings along Riefeld Road tend to be set back from the road, with driveways to the front and there is a mix of semi-detached and detached

properties. Many feature gables and painted render, hanging tiles and similar 'Arts and Crafts' style characteristics can be seen throughout the street. Properties have been extended in a variety of ways.

6. The extension as seen from the street would have two storeys, with the ground floor being flush with the existing front elevation, and the first floor stepped back. The roof lines would follow the original, providing a similar hipped gable, and the ground floor would have a canopy treatment similar to the existing.
7. Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (adopted July 2014) ("the Local Plan") sets out criteria for extensions, including ensuring that a 'terracing effect' is avoided and that roof extensions should respect the scale and character of the host building, street scene and surrounding area. This guidance is detailed in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document¹ ("SPD").
8. The proposed development would be brought close to the boundary with no 27 although the hipped gable features would be retained and as such the roof would slope away from that neighbour. The proposed hipped roof would ensure that the distinction between properties would be retained, particularly given the contrast between the gable end of no. 27 and the hipped roof of no. 25. Whilst I acknowledge that the street has many properties with generous spacing between them, taking into account the above considerations, the development would not create a terracing effect and would respect the scale and character of the host building, street scene and surrounding area and as such has regard to the policies of the Local Plan.
9. I therefore find no conflict with policies found within the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) nor the policies within the London Plan² or the policies in the Local Plan, all of which expect a high quality of design from development, including being of a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality.

Living conditions

10. The proposed rear extension would project 4.6m from the original rear wall at the boundary adjacent to number 23 (to the south). At my site visit I was able to see that no. 23 has full height glazed doors with a small row of windows above. The proposed extension would create a solid flanking wall along this boundary and would protrude beyond the existing rear flat roofed element at no. 23. Whilst I acknowledge that the development would be single storey and flat-roofed only, I consider that the depth of the proposed extension would create an oppressive and enclosing effect to the living conditions of no.23 and would cause harm to living conditions by way of loss of daylight and sunlight.
11. The proposed rear extensions would project 3.6m from the rear wall of the original house at the boundary adjacent to number 27 (to the north) with a 1m gap to the boundary. Whilst this adheres to the guidance in the SPD, I consider the rear extension combined with the two-storey side extension would result in an overbearing effect on this neighbour.

¹ Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (December 2018)

² The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for London (March 2016)

12. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties by way of an oppressive outlook and an unneighbourly sense of enclosure to the properties at no.23 and no.27. It would conflict with those parts of Policies DH(a) and DH(b) of the Local Plan and the SPD which seek to ensure extensions respect the amenities of adjacent occupiers.

Conclusion

13. I have found that there is no harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling nor to the local area. However, there would be a detrimental effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 23 and no. 27 and the proposals would fail to comply with the policies of the Local Plan and cannot comply with the development plan as a whole. I therefore conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR