The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:29th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3312792
5 Lassa Road, London SE9 6PU

- 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 and Mrs David and Maxine McCarthy and Piere against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich
- The application Ref 22/2525/HD, dated 26 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2022.
- The development proposed is the erection of a single-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 building and the surrounding area, and

   (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 6 Lassa Road, with particular regard to outlook and natural light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house. If forms part of a group of handsome semi-detached houses of similar age and appearance which are raised above street level and feature bow windows and hipped roofs. To the rear these houses include original 2-storey rear wings with flat roofs that occupy slightly more than half the width of the rear elevations of each house. Some of the properties, including those to either side of the appeal property, have single-storey rear additions attached to the rear wings.

4. The proposal would comprise the erection of a single-storey rear addition that would extend across the entirety of the rear of the appeal property and wrap around the 2-storey rear wing. Whilst this would extend a similar distance into the rear garden as the extensions to either side, it would be more than twice the size. In the context of the far more modest additions to either side, the proposal would be an incongruous and overly prominent form of development

that would also be at odds with the established pattern of development in the area.

5. Due to its siting and size, I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. As such it 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 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

6. The proposal would result in the formation of a long flank wall next to the boundary of the appeal site shared with 6 Lassa Road, the attached property. This would be significantly taller than the fence on the boundary at present. It would also be larger and more permanent than the vegetation that covers the fence. Due to its height, siting and significant rear protrusion the flank wall would severely enclose the space immediately to the rear of No. 6 and significantly reduce outlook from, and levels of natural light reaching, the rear-facing ground floor room in the main body of the house.

7. For these reasons the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 6. It therefore fails to comply with RGLP Policy DH(b) and the aims of the SPD, both of which seek to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has referred to the small infill extension at 2 Lassa Road and a planning permission for a modest wrap-around single-storey addition at No. 19. Both schemes are smaller than the appeal proposal and therefore not directly comparable. In any event, each planning application and appeal must be considered on its individual merits having regard to its context and design. As such I attribute limited weight to the schemes referred to.

9. I note that there were no objections to the proposal. This fact does not outweigh the requirement to determine the appeal against the development plan.

Conclusion

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

S Poole

INSPECTOR