



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 09 November 2021 by Ms S Maur

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3280320

Site Address: 23 Glenhouse Road, Eltham 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 Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 21/1638/HD, dated 5 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing rear extension and construction of a new single storey rear extension and rear steps.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The Council amended the description of the development and this has also been utilised by the appellant in the appeal form. As this more accurately describes the proposal, I have taken the description from the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed single storey rear extension on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupants at No.25 with regard to light and whether it would create a sense of enclosure.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling, which is located on the west side of Glenhouse Road. There is an existing single storey extension that covers much of the rear of the property, which is attached to the single storey offshoot. The neighbouring property, No.25 is also an end of terrace property that sits at a lower ground level and is located north of the appeal dwelling. No.25 has not been extended at the rear, however there is a small offshoot located towards the north. Both dwellings have a rear access between the houses with the gardens bounded by a brick wall. No.25 has glass patio doors that open onto a small patio and are located close to the brick wall boundary. The patio doors are visible from the rear garden of No.23, over the brick wall.

6. The Royal Borough of Greenwich Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions, Conversions and Basements 2018 (SPD) requires careful attention to be given to the size, position, height and design of extensions in order to minimise overshadowing. It also advises that, in respect of the depth of rear extensions, they should not project more than 3.6m from the rear wall of the original house, as a deeper extension could block daylight and sunlight for neighbouring properties. The appellant and the Council confirm that, in total, the extension would project 6m from the rear of the dwelling. This would appear as a significant extension when seen from the rear of, and within the garden of number 25. It would result in a loss of light and create a sense of enclosure.
7. Although there is a gap between the properties, the close arrangement to the shared boundary and the lower-level positioning of No.25 would exacerbate the loss of sunlight and daylight to the ground floor windows. Despite the lack of parapet, the proposal would still appear as significantly large in length and height, when experienced from the rear and side of No.25. It would fail to accord with the advice in the SPD.
8. A previous scheme which included a first-floor element was dismissed at appeal¹ has been referred to. Unlike the previous scheme, the current proposal does not incorporate a first-floor extension. It nevertheless must be considered on its own merits and in this case. The design of the extension would be in keeping with the dwelling, but in the overall consideration of the appeal, this is a neutral matter.
9. There would be improvements, for the appellant, to the rear garden and overall accommodation needs. The proposed length of the extension has been influenced by a potential sewer running parallel to the house, which could cause some technical issues if the depth were lessened. Collectively, these factors relate to private benefits and so only carry limited weight. They would not outweigh or mitigate the harm identified.
10. Given the above, the rear extension would cause undue harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupants at No.25. As such, the proposal would not comply with Policy DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies which seeks to permit extensions that do not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers, by reducing the amount of daylight, sunlight or result in an unneighbourly sense of enclosure.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/E5330/D/20/3249137