



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2022

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18TH August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3297356

34 Llanover Road, Woolwich, London SE18 3SU

- 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 Stephanie Robinson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 21/4204/HD, dated 20 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as a "*a two-part double-storey rear extension*"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposals on:
 - (i) the character and appearance of the host property, and
 - (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 32 Llanover Road, with particular regard to natural light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey, semi-detached house with a single-storey outrigger to the rear containing a kitchen and a bathroom. This element mirrors the arrangement at the rear of 32 Llanover Road, giving the attached pair of houses a high degree of symmetry at the rear. The wider area predominately comprises terraced housing. These dwellings include a varied range of single and 2-storey rear outriggers.
4. The proposal would comprise the erection of a full-width, wrap-around, ground floor addition combined with a first floor extension above a large proportion of the existing outrigger. The ground floor addition would extend a significant distance beyond the existing rear building line of the appeal property, its attached pair and many nearby houses. The full-width footprint of this element would be at odds with the arrangement at No.32 and most other nearby properties. As such, due to its siting, width and extent of rearward projection, this element would be an alien and incongruous addition. This would be exacerbated by the proposed first floor element.

5. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property. It therefore fails to comply with Policies DH(a) and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) (RGLP) which, among other matters, require development to be of a high quality of design, limited to a scale and design appropriate to the locality. The proposal is contrary to the aims of Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and the guidance in the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD).

Living Conditions

6. The first floor addition would result in the formation of a long flank wall along the boundary shared with No.32. This would reduce levels of outlook from, and natural light to, first floor windows in No.32. The window closest to the boundary serves a staircase whereas the larger window, which is further from the shared boundary, serves a bedroom. As the small window provides light to, and outlook from, a non-habitable space and the bedroom window is large and set away from the appeal property, which is to the north, I am satisfied that adequate levels of natural light and outlook would be retained with the proposed development in place.
7. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.32. In this respect it therefore complies with RGLP Policy DH(b) and the aims of the SPD both of which seek to protect the amenity to adjacent occupiers.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has referred to the neighbouring properties, some of which have quite substantial outriggers and additions. There is no evidence before me to indicate that any of the additions have been granted planning permission in recent years. In some cases it would appear that outriggers are either original elements or pre-date the planning system. In any case, each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits and against current development plan policy.
9. I recognise the appellant's need for additional living space. However, this is not sufficient to outweigh the planning harm identified under the first main issue.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out under the first main issue, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR