



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2020

by Rebecca Thomas MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/20/3249137
23 Glenhouse Road, London SE9 1JH

- 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 W Trinh against the decision of the Council of the Royal London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 19/3936/HD, dated 4 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is Part single/two storey rear extension and hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal it is stated that the description of development has not changed, but a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.
3. The appeal documents include the previous planning appeal decision¹ allowed on 6 August 2019 ("the 2019 decision") and have been provided with the Inspector's decision letter. That appeal allowed for the construction of a hip-to-gable roof extension, rear dormer roof extension and installation of 4 rooflights to front roofslope at the appeal site. These elements are included in the proposed development before me, with the addition of single storey and first floor extensions to the rear. The proposal would require demolition of the existing single storey lean-to and conservatory elements at the property.
4. The third reason for refusal given on the Council's decision notice relates to inconsistencies on the submitted plans. This in part appears to be due to the time passed and various additional or amended plans. The parties agree that there are some variations between plans and elevations. Notwithstanding, I consider that these inconsistencies are not material to my decision and as such I have made my assessment based on the documents before me.

¹ APP/E5330/D/19/3228255

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
- (i) The character and appearance of the host dwelling and the immediate area and;
 - (ii) The living conditions of the occupiers of number 25 Glenhouse Road, having particular regard to daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The appeal site is a red and London brick double-fronted end of terrace dwelling with a hipped roof located on a residential street. The street is characterised by similar runs of red brick terraced dwellings, many with defined gable features with lintel details to the front. I note from the appeal documents that the parties agree that the hip-to-gable roof extension, rear dormer roof extension and installation of four rooflights to the front roofslope do not differ from the previously permitted development as permitted by the 2019 decision.
7. The appeal before me includes additional rear extensions to the ground and first floor. The rear extensions would not be visible from the street and I consider would not harm the overall character of the host dwelling. Whilst there is an increase in proposed development, the proposed rear extensions to the ground and first floors would not protrude beyond the existing roof slope or ridge of the house. The extensions would be retained within the width of the host dwelling, and the staggered widths would add variety. I have had regard to the wide variety of rear extensions in the local area, which include flat roofed elements at differing heights. I also consider that the defining characteristics of the property are to the front elevation, and I do not find that the development would harm the character or appearance of the host property or the wider terrace.
8. Whilst I accept the development should be considered as a whole, I can see no changes to the appeal before me, nor to the street and host dwelling or neighbouring properties which would suggest that there is a change in circumstances that would lead me to a different conclusion with regard to the impacts on the character and appearance to the host dwelling and local area as a result of the roof extensions and installation of rooflights.
9. Therefore, I consider that the proposals would not harm the character and appearance of Glenhouse Road nor the host dwelling, and as such would accord with policies SH1 and SH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 ("the Local Plan"), and the guidance in the Council's SPD². These policies require all new development to achieve high quality design, to positively contribute to the improvement of the built environment taking account of the architecture, scale, height, bulk and massing of the adjacent townscape, avoid a 'terracing effect' and be limited to a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality. It would also comply with

² Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (December 2018)

policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2016 which guides the policy for the Local Plan.

Living Conditions

10. The appeal site has a side access on the elevation closest to the boundary with no. 25, which also has a small gap to the boundary with the appeal site. I was able to see on my site visit that no. 25, has a small rear outrigger with a catslide roof and a variety of doors and windows opening onto a courtyard. No. 25 is set at a lower level to the appeal site and the gardens of both properties fall away to the rear. The proposed rear extensions would reflect the extent of the existing width of the host dwelling, thus retaining the existing gap between the properties.
11. The Council confirms that the ground floor rear extension would measure 6m deep from the original rear elevation of the dwelling. This, combined with the first floor rear extension would result in a height of 7m at the boundary with no. 25. I accept that there are dimensional changes between the extensions at ground and first floor in that the first floor would be set back from the full extent of the proposed ground floor extension, however taken as a whole, this does not remove the full extent of the overall development and its impact to the neighbouring property at no. 25.
12. I consider that the development would create an overbearing element to that neighbour, contributing to a loss of daylight and sunlight. This would be due to the changes in levels between the properties, the scale, design and position south of, and close to, the shared boundary and would appear large and overbearing when viewed from the house and garden at no 25. It would create a gloomy and oppressive outlook and an unneighbourly sense of enclosure and as such a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 25. I note that the appellant asserts that the side elevations of the extension would be finished with a white or off white colour and this would allow light to reflect back to the neighbouring properties. Nonetheless, I do not consider this would sufficiently mitigate for the overbearing impact of the proposed development.
13. The development would therefore conflict with those parts of policies DH1 and Dh(a) of the Local Plan and the Guidance under the SPD. These, amongst other things, seek to ensure developments do not cause unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers by reducing the amount of daylight or sunlight or result in an unneighbourly sense of enclosure.

Conclusion

14. The appeal proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling and the immediate area. However, it would have a detrimental effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 25, which outweighs the lack of harm found on the issue of character and appearance. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR