



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3313470

159 Marmadon Road, Plumstead, Greenwich SE18 1EG

- 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 Serifat Taiwo against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref 22/2456/HD, dated 20 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on:
 - The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers, with reference to 157 Marmadon Road (No.157); and
 - The character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey detached house which forms part of a run of austere designed 20th Century houses. Due to the staggered arrangement of these houses, the appeal dwelling sits forward of the neighbouring houses at No. 157 and 161 Marmadon Road (No.161). This staggered arrangement is a defining element in the streetscene of this part of the street, which otherwise has a variety of other designs of terraced houses of differing ages that have a more traditional parallel relationship with the street frontage.
4. The appeal dwelling has an 'L' shaped plan with its main entrance on its longest flank, which faces towards No. 161. The narrow flank of the appeal dwelling faces towards the front garden of No. 157. The proposal is for a flat roofed ground floor wrap around rear extension that would project to the rear and would align with the existing narrow flank of the appeal property and the boundary with No.157.

5. Due to the length of the wall of the proposed extension on the boundary with No.157, it would reach almost to the front elevation of this neighbouring property, allowing for a gap of approximately 0.3 Metres. This would also result in the proposed flank wall of the proposed extensions being in close proximity to a ground floor bay on the front of No. 157.
6. Given the close relationship between the appeal property and No.157, the proposed extension would be highly visible from the garden space and rear rooms of No.93. The height, depth and proximity of the proposed extension to No.157 would result in it appearing as intrusive and enclosing, with a domineering and overbearing effect, particularly when viewed from the front room with the bay window at the front of No.157. This would result in the proposed extension being experienced by the occupiers of No.157 as an oppressive presence, thereby causing an unacceptable loss of outlook for its occupiers.
7. The proposed extension would be significantly taller than the existing boundary wall between the rear garden of the appeal dwelling and the front garden of the appeal property. Due to the height and close proximity of the proposed extension to the front bay window of No.157, it would block out morning sunlight to this window and would also reduce the availability of indirect daylight available to the room that it serves. This would result in an unacceptable loss of sunlight and indirect daylight to this room throughout the year, which would significantly accentuate the oppressive presence of the proposed extension that I have detailed above.

Character and appearance

8. Although the appeal dwelling sits in a staggered arrangement with the neighbouring houses. The houses are carefully planned and arranged to allow for daylight, openness and a moderate degree of enclosure and concomitant privacy. Although austere in architectural expression, this plan and arrangement of houses represents a well balanced piece of urban design.
9. Due to its extent, height, roof form and close proximity to No.157 the proposed extension fails to reflect the design of the appeal dwelling or that of its neighbours. Rather, as it would be readily apparent from views of the property from the street, it would appear as a dominating and incongruous addition to the appeal dwelling. This would also result in it being unsympathetic to the architectural qualities of the staggered group of houses of which it is part and would, therefore, be detrimental to the local streetscene.
10. For these reasons, the proposed extension would result in substantial harm to the living conditions of the residential occupiers of No.157, as well as substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area. This would not accord with the guidance given in the 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 of 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, respond to context, integrate with the local area and provide for appropriate outlook and sufficient daylight to surrounding housing, so as to not undermine the quality of life of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Conclusion

11. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR