

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2021

**by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 5 January 2022**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3280441**

### **177 Alnwick Road, Eltham, SE12 9BX**

- 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 Mrs R Brukiene against the decision of the Council of The Royal Borough of Greenwich.
  - The application 21/1802/HD, dated 17 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2021.
  - The development proposed is construction of a ground floor rear extension, ground and first floor side extension, front porch and loft conversion comprising gable end, rear dormer window and front rooflights.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Main issues**

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on, firstly, the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area and, secondly, the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

### **Reasons**

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal property lies within an estate having an attractive, spacious character. This derives from the planned layout of streets and properties including, in the vicinity of the appeal site, houses set around a relatively large area of greenspace. The position of houses on the corner of this greenspace evidently formed part of this planned layout, with the siting and orientation of the houses contributing to the feeling of spaciousness.
  4. The proposed works to the property are substantial additions. The extension to the side would fill much of the width of the plot, bringing a large building mass close to the boundary of the site. The scale of this addition would be emphasised by the front of the extension continuing the existing front elevation and roof plane of the host property, with a gable end proposed to the extension. This would create an overwhelming addition and an imbalanced appearance to the pair of houses, which would be highly visible in the area.
  5. The appellant has drawn my attention to extensions at other properties in the area, and I viewed those at my site visit. I do not consider those comparable
-

since they are not of such great a scale as that proposed in the appeal scheme, nor do they fill or overwhelm their plots in such a prominent location as the appeal site. Hence, my findings remain unchanged.

6. On the first main issue it is therefore concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and hence not consistent with the relevant policies of the development plan that seek to ensure residential extensions are of a scale and design appropriate to the area, namely Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014), and the Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD).

#### *Living conditions*

7. The orientation of the appeal property on the site and neighbouring houses means that the rear elevation of No. 177 is set relatively close to the boundary with No. 179. The proposed development shows a large rear dormer addition. The scale of this, number of windows and proximity to the boundary mean that in this elevated position there would be direct overlooking to the neighbouring property and gardens beyond. This would be of a degree to represent a material loss of privacy.
8. I do not see that obscure windows to these rooms, as offered by the appellant, would address this matter as it would create an unsatisfactory standard of accommodation within the appeal property.
9. I acknowledge that there was no objection to the proposed development from the neighbouring occupiers. However, I must consider the proposals with regard to the longer term objective of seeking good quality development that does not adversely affect the stock of housing in the Borough.
10. On the second main issue it is therefore concluded the proposal would be harmful to living conditions, contrary to Policy DH(b) of the Core Strategy and the SPD, which seek to protect amenity for adjacent occupiers.

#### *Conclusion*

11. The proposed development would conflict with the policies of the development plan for the reasons given. The appeal is dismissed accordingly.

*C J Leigh*

INSPECTOR