



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2023

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3309995

83 Westcombe Hill, Blackheath, Greenwich, London SE3 7DU

- 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 Rajinder Sanger against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/2278/HD, dated 5 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of single storey rear/side infill ground floor extension and first floor side extension on rear outrigger.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effect on:
 - The character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area; and
 - The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey palisaded mid terraced house with rear garden. The local area is made of similar terraced properties and larger semi-detached houses. The terrace, of which the appeal dwelling forms part, backs on to an elevated section of the A102 Blackwall Tunnel Southern Approach road. The terrace forms a barrier between the visual effect of this road and Westcombe Park Conservation Area (the CA), the eastern boundary of which runs down the street at Westcombe Hill at this point.
4. The proposal would extend the existing outrigger by way of ground floor rear and side extensions and a first floor side extension. The proposed first floor side extension would result in a widening of the main rear part of the outrigger, with an inset to accommodate the existing first floor rear window of the appeal dwelling. This would result in the proposed extension sitting in front of much of the existing window, with a gap between of approximately 2 metres, resulting in a visually cramped and architecturally incoherent relationship between the outrigger as extended by the proposal and the main house.

5. I acknowledge that the appellant has sought to overcome the reasons given for dismissal of a previous appeal for a proposal for rear extensions. However, whilst the ground elements of the proposal would appear to sit as subservient additions to the appeal dwelling, taken as a whole, the proposal would appear as a visually dominating and incongruous addition to the appeal property.
6. This would be apparent from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties and the more open views from the elevated road. In these views the proposal would not conform to the arrangement of outriggers and rear extensions that form the rear architectural expression of the terrace and would not appear as a complementary addition to the rear of the terrace. Therefore, the proposal would not be a complementary addition to the townscape and streetscene of the local area.
7. However, with my statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in mind, I find that the scale, and the rear positioning of the proposal away from the Boundary with the CA would not result in any harm to the setting of the CA. Lack of harm in this instance is a neutral factor in my considerations.
8. The appellant has brought to my attention other approved planning applications for extensions in the wider area. However, no detailed material relating to these was submitted and they would have been considered on their own individual merits. I have done likewise in my consideration of the appeal proposal.

Living Conditions

9. The proposed ground floor side extension would infill the passageway to the side and to the rear extent of the existing outrigger. This would have a pitched roof approximately 2.4 metres in height adjacent to the boundary with 85 Westcombe Hill (No.85), rising to approximately 2.8 metres, where it would connect with the outrigger.
10. The existing boundary fence between these two terraced houses is in close proximity to the glazed rear door to the main house at No.85 and rear ground floor bay window and glazed door in the side of its outrigger. The height and proximity of the existing fence does already tightly enclose part of the existing passageway at No.85. The proposed single storey side extension would, however, be substantially taller than the existing fence and would create a tunnel like arrangement for the passageway. This would have a domineering, enclosing and overbearing effect that would be experienced by the occupiers of No.85 as oppressive.
11. Despite the East facing aspect of the rear of the appeal dwelling, the bulk and massing of the proposal and its proximity would also unacceptably restrict the amount of daylight and sunlight reaching the passageway at No.85 and the rooms served by the rear ground floor windows and doors in the main house and outrigger.
12. For the reasons given, this would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area and further substantial harm to the living conditions of the residential occupiers of No.85. This would not accord with the guidance given in Royal Borough of Greenwich Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary

Planning Document (2018), and would be contrary to policies DH1, DH(a) and DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy (2014), policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraphs 130 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions, demonstrate high quality design, integrate with the local area and provide for appropriate outlook and sufficient daylight to surrounding housing and do not undermine the quality of life of neighbouring residential occupiers.

13. Whilst the proposal would result in a larger dwelling with additional living space, the benefits of the proposal are primarily of a private nature and I have, therefore, only afforded this limited weight in my considerations. These benefits do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

14. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR