
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2022 by A Humphries BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/21/3285265

129 Annandale Road, Greenwich, London, SE10 0JY

- 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 Michael Davies against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/2066/HD, dated 3 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a part one/part two storey rear extension, installation of three rooflights and associated external works.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. There is a certain degree of variation between the description of development taken from the application form and that utilised by the Council to describe the scheme. It is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the Council's description of development is a more accurate reflection of the works proposed and I note the appellant also adopted this version within the Grounds of Appeal, and this is as reflected in the description above.

Main Issue

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - The character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and,
 - The living conditions of the occupants of 131 Annandale Road, with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

5. Annandale Road is principally characterised by period terraced dwellings with stepped roofs and outriggers. The interjection of modern terraced and flat

roofed dwellings in block form have created some variation within the street scene, with the host dwelling of this more modern design.

6. The proposed development would see a part single storey/part two-storey rear and side wrap around extension to the existing two-storey outrigger. Set below the roof level, the two-storey element would be limited in width to the side of the outrigger with only the one-storey element protruding beyond the existing rear façade.
7. The flat roof to the proposed development would accord with the design and appearance of existing flat roofs on Park Mews, and the varied roof form of outriggers including a flat roofed outrigger of a neighbouring dwelling. With the extension set to the rear of the host dwelling and below the roof level, the proposed development would not affect the stepped roof levels that characterise Annandale Road. Although the proposed development would be visible from Calvert Road, any visibility would be limited because of the distance from the street and limited available vistas, primarily restricted to the entrance to Park Mews. The proposed development would also be viewed in the context of surrounding flat roofs. Owing to the varied built form, particularly in relation to the outriggers, the proposed development would not detract from the character of the immediate locality.
8. The extent of the proposed development would neither significantly alter the overall proportions of the host dwelling nor reduce the garden to an unusable size and would not therefore dominate the host dwelling or its curtilage.
9. For the reasons above, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposed development would accord with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) (the Local Plan) and the pertinent aims of the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance (2018). Whilst contrary to part of Policy DH(a) of the Local Plan, the proposed development would be in general conformity with the overall aim of this policy. Together, these policies require high quality design that respects the scale and character of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Living conditions

10. The appellant submitted a daylight and sunlight report with the appeal. On the basis of the conclusions of the technical report, the Council has subsequently accepted that the proposed development would not result in unacceptable daylight and sunlight impacts to No. 131. On this basis, and in the absence of any other evidence to the contrary, I see no reason to disagree with this conclusion. I have therefore focused on the issues related to outlook and a sense of enclosure.
11. The flank elevations of the host dwelling and No.131 are separated by a wooden fence and comparatively narrow passageways that lead on from the rear doors to the main garden area. Both the evidence before me and my observations on site indicate that the ground floor rear door to No. 131 lead to a habitable room. The two-storey element of the proposed development would extend to the boundary, and when taken in conjunction with the existing three-storey flank wall of the neighbouring property, the outlook from the ground floor door to the neighbouring habitable room would be significantly worsened

by the proposal. This would be principally due to the resultant 'tunnelling' effect caused by the length and height of the extended offshoot which would appear as a dominant and overbearing form of development, and would create a harmful sense of enclosure.

12. For the above reasons, the proposed development would cause undue harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No.131 in terms of outlook, contrary to Policy DH(b) of the Local Plan. This policy seeks to protect the amenity of adjacent occupants, including from a sense of enclosure.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. I have concluded that the proposed development would neither result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling nor to the surrounding area. Although I also sympathise with the appellant's desire to make improvements and extensions to the property, the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of No. 131 in terms of outlook and a sense of enclosure.
14. The development therefore conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

A Humphries

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR