



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7<sup>th</sup> April 2022

**by Megan Thomas Q.C. Barrister-at-Law**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities**

**Decision date: 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3290567**

**230 Shooters Hill Road, Blackheath SE3 8UW**

- 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 Jamores Care Homes against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
  - The application Ref.21/3271/HD, dated 1<sup>st</sup> September 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2021.
  - The development proposed is a single storey 6m rear extension to provide a contemporary kitchen living and bathroom spaces.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, and the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of 228 Shooters Hill Road in respect of outlook and light.

### Reasons

#### *Character and Appearance*

3. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached building with some on-site front parking and a rear garden. Its semi-pair is no.228 and at the rear they are separated by a close-boarded fence (graduated in height). They are located on the south side of Shooters Hill Road and the immediate area is predominantly residential. There is a small outbuilding in the rear garden of no.230 not far from the rear elevation that is used as a WC.
4. The proposal is to construct a single storey rear extension. It would extend beyond the rear elevation of the building by about 5.95m and it would span the full width of the property which is about 5.95m. It would have an eaves height of about 2.8m and a maximum height of about 3.2m inclusive of a parapet wall. It would have a flat roof with a rooflight in it which would not protrude above the parapet wall. The west wall of the proposed extension would sit along the common boundary with no.228.

5. The Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) advises that it is important that rear extensions do not dominate and remain subservient to the original house. The proposed extension would not step in from the flank wall of the main dwelling but would be flush with it. That lack of articulation would contribute to the appearance of a dominant extension and it would erode the distinctiveness of the original dwelling. Coupled with the proposed depth and height of the extension, the proposal would not appear subservient to the modestly-sized main building. Whilst the ground floor floorspace would not be doubled in area, the proposed floorspace would be disproportionately large compared with the existing ground floor floorspace. The proposed materials on the external surfaces of the extension would not sufficiently ameliorate the dominant appearance of the extension, nor would the size of the remaining rear garden.
6. On this issue, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area and would conflict with policy D3 of The London Plan 2021, policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (adopted 2014), and the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Supplementary Planning Document (2018).

*Living Conditions of Occupants of 228 Shooters Hill Road*

7. The rear elevation of 228 at ground floor level has a bow window closest to the common boundary with 230 and a small porch with fenestration and a door with a glass panel. The western flank of the proposed extension would extend along the common boundary for about 5.95m at a height of about 3.2m which would block a significant amount of light from reaching the bow window and the room that it serves.
8. Furthermore, when looking out of that window the proposed extension would cause a sense of enclosure for the occupants of 228 owing to its proximity, depth and height. I am also concerned that part of the garden closest to the bow window would be unduly overshadowed and that occupants using that part of the garden would find the flank wall overbearing and enclosing. Overall, the impacts for the occupants of 228 in respect of their outlook and their enjoyment of light would be significantly different from the existing impact of the close-boarded fence. It would be unduly detrimental.
9. On this issue, I find that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupants of 228 Shooters Hill Road by causing an unacceptable loss of light and unacceptable loss of outlook. It would be contrary to policy DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) and the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Supplementary Planning Document (2018).
10. It is said that the building is used for the care of vulnerable adults and young people and that the careworkers are in need of improved facilities. I have borne this in mind and deeply sympathise with that need, however, the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the host building and to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupants outweighs that need. I have also had regard to the fact that there are other rear extensions to buildings on the south side of Shooters Hill Road and elsewhere, but I have determined this appeal on its own particular facts, impacts and merits as I am obliged to do.

## **Conclusion**

11. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

*Megan Thomas Q.C.*

INSPECTOR