



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2022

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3303758

11 Masons Hill, Woolwich, London SE18 6EJ

- 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 Evy Bauwens against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/1450/HD, dated 27 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a ground floor side-return infill extension, a first floor extension to the outrigger, a bay window to the front elevation at ground floor level and a rear dormer loft conversion including an increase to the roof ridge.
-

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, the terrace and the surrounding area, and (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 12 Masons Hill, with particular regard to outlook and natural light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey mid-terrace house with a pitched roof and a part-single and part 2-storey outrigger to the rear. It forms part of a group of 7 houses of similar age and appearance which were built in a stepped arrangement reflecting the steep fall of the street. The group of houses include flat frontages with framed entrances. They retain the original roof form and have a mix of single and 2-storey outriggers that extend a similar distance to the rear. These features give the group a degree of unity, which is a matter to which I attach significant weight. The group of houses is book-ended at the top of the street by a house with a prominent double-storey bay. This property is somewhat of an anomaly in the street scene.
4. The proposal would include the erection of a bay window at ground floor level at the front of the house. I note this would improve natural light levels and energy efficiency within the front room. I also note that the house at the end of the terrace includes a prominent double-storey bay. However, this addition

would be entirely at odds with the style, age and appearance of the host property and the group of houses of which it forms a key part.

5. The proposal would also involve the erection of a full-width, flat-roofed dormer occupying the entirety of the rear roof slope and requiring a slight increase in the ridge level. Due to its height, bulk and elevated siting this aspect of the proposal would be an overly prominent and incongruous addition that would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the group of houses of which it forms part.
6. For these reasons the bay window and dormer additions fail to accord with Policies DH(a) and DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014) which, among other matters, require a high quality of design, limited to a scale and design appropriate to the locality. There is also conflict with 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).

Living Conditions

7. There is a significant change in level between the appeal property and its neighbour, 12 Masons Hill. As a result of this the rear ground floor windows serving No.12 are enclosed by the fence on the boundary between the adjacent properties and by the 2-storey outrigger at the rear of the appeal property.
8. The appeal proposal would include a single-storey rear addition next to the shared boundary, that would be taller than the fence it would replace, together with a rear 2-storey addition to the outrigger. The combined effect of these additions would be to further enclose the windows at the rear of No.12 and reduce outlook from, and natural light to, ground floor rooms. The appellant has put forward studies that purport to suggest the impact would be small. However, without clear evidence that these studies are based on accurate survey data, I attach limited weight to this information.
9. Based on my site observations, I conclude that, due to their height, bulk, siting and rear protrusion, the rear additions would result in reductions in outlook and natural light that would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.12. This aspect of the proposal therefore fails to accord with Local Plan Policy DH(b) and the aforementioned SPD, both of which seek to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers.

Other Matters

10. I recognise that the proposal would provide additional space for a growing family and the works would improve the property's energy efficiency. These benefits do not however outweigh the harm identified above.
11. This is a householder appeal and therefore has to be considered against the application drawings. The suggested amendment to the dormer is not therefore a matter before me for consideration.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR