



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2023

by A Wright BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3310856

68 Leysdown Road, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 3NB

- 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 Naz and Saban Akkoch against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 22/2802/HD, dated 19 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2022.
 - The development is a proposed ground floor extension, 1st floor side infill and loft conversion with dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 66 Leysdown Road (No 66) with particular regard to outlook and light; and
 - the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached house located within a residential area where hipped-roof semi-detached properties are prevalent. It faces Leysdown Road and backs onto houses on Porcupine Close. The appeal property and the adjoining house retain their original hipped roofs, the sides of which are lower than the main ridgeline. Some dwellings in the road have hip to gable roof extensions or two storey side extensions which have caused some erosion to the character of the area.
4. For attached houses, the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD) indicates that single storey rear extensions should not normally project more than 3.6m from the rear wall of the original house as a deeper extension could block daylight and sunlight for neighbouring properties. Whilst I note that this is only guidance, it gives an indication of the sizes of extension which the Council considers to be acceptable.

5. The attached dwelling at No 66 is located north east of the appeal site and has rear patio doors close to the mutual boundary. The outlook from and light to this room is already affected by an existing rear extension on the appeal property. However, whilst I note that the roof of the proposed single storey extension has been designed with a roof profile which pitches away from the mutual boundary, it would result in an extension with a parapet height of 3.1m projecting 4.1m along the mutual boundary, 1.1m longer than the existing one. The projection and height of the extension along this boundary, the orientation of No 66 relative to the appeal site and the close proximity of the patio doors at No 66 to the proposal would result in a harmful loss of sunlight and daylight and dominate the outlook from the southernmost ground floor room at No 66.
6. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of 66 Leysdown Road with particular regard to outlook and light. This would be contrary to Policy DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 which requires extensions to not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers by reducing the amount of daylight or sunlight or resulting in an unneighbourly sense of enclosure. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires decisions to ensure safe and healthy living conditions. In addition, it would not comply with the SPD where it requires extensions to not overshadow neighbouring habitable rooms, result in an unneighbourly sense of enclosure or reduce the amount of daylight they receive.

Character and appearance

7. The proposal would result in the lower part of the roof being raised to align with the highest part of the roof to accommodate a rear dormer. Whilst the extension would result in some loss of symmetry and balance with the adjoining dwelling at No 66, it would maintain the hipped roof form and affect the symmetry of the semi-detached dwellings to a far lesser extent than existing hip to gable roof extensions in the vicinity. As a result, the proposed roof extension would not cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the site, the pair of semi-detached dwellings or the wider locality.
8. The large, rear dormer would occupy much of the extended roof and have a profile to match the proposed ground floor rear extension. There is an existing rear box dormer occupying most of an extended roof at 62 Leysdown Road which has already affected the appearance of the rear roofs in this part of the street. The proposed dormer would be set in from the eaves and ridgelines of the appeal property and from the adjoining property and it would only be publicly visible at a distance from the end of the cul de sac at Porcupine Close to the rear. As such, it would not be a dominant and overbearing addition to the property.
9. Overall, I conclude that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would comply with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014. These require developments to take account of spatial character and extensions to be of a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality. It would also be in accordance with the Framework where development should be sympathetic to local character. Additionally, it would comply with the Council's Residential Extensions,

Basements and Conversions Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD) where it states that extensions should respect the street scene and character of the area.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred to two expired planning permissions and an extant certificate of lawful development for roof and first floor rear infill extensions to the appeal property. As I have not found harm in respect of the proposed changes to the roof, including the dormer, and the first-floor rear infill extension, it has not been necessary to consider the fallback position.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

A Wright

INSPECTOR