



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2021

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3260207

24 Glenlyon Road, Eltham SE9 1AJ

- 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 D Hand against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 20/2220/HD, dated 29 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. However, the original description adequately describes the proposal and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 26 Glenlyon Road (No.26) with particular regard to outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a large semi-detached residential dwelling set on Glenlyon Road. It is attached to No.26 which sits closely to the north east. This property has an opening in the form of a set of glazed doors with a window above on its rear elevation close to the boundary with the appeal property. There is no indication that this opening does not serve a habitable room.
5. A full width single storey flat roof extension to the rear of the host property is proposed. The extension would therefore effectively be placed on the boundary with No.26. Accounting for both the overall height of the extension and its depth it would form a substantial and notable feature when viewed from the rear opening on No.26.
6. The height and depth of the extension, combined with its position so close to the boundary would result in a loss of outlook from the opening on the neighbouring property that would result in a significant sense of enclosure for the neighbouring occupiers. Further, given these factors, there is nothing within the evidence to assure me that there would be no unacceptable loss of

daylight or sunlight, given that the extension would sit closely to the south west of No.26.

7. SPD¹ guidance seeks to guard against full width extensions instead suggesting that they should be set back from the boundary in circumstances such as those at the appeal site to guard against loss of light and impacts relating to outlook and enclosure. The proposal therefore does not accord with SPD guidance. Nor does it accord with Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan (2014) nor Policy 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) which amongst other things seek well designed development that protects amenity of adjacent occupiers.

Other Matters

8. Reference has been made to a permitted development fall-back position for a similar rear extension. However, an extension of the type proposed would be subject to a prior approval procedure, the outcome of which could not be guaranteed as it would involve consulting the neighbouring occupiers. While I acknowledge that they have not objected to this proposal, I cannot rule out the neighbours, or their opinions, changing. As a result of these factors I therefore afford the suggested fall-back position limited weight.
9. It has also been stated that a similar extension has been approved at a property nearby, although I cannot be certain on the basis of the limited evidence before me that the circumstances are exactly the same. In any event, each appeal is dealt with on its own merits and I afford this matter limited weight.

Conclusion

10. Taking all relevant matters into account, the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR

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