
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2024

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3332804

52 Bannockburn Road, Plumstead SE18 1EP

- 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 S Mamku against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 23/2543/HD, dated 31 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey rear side extension infill.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear side extension infill at 52 Bannockburn Road, Plumstead SE18 1EP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/2543/HD, dated 31 July 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 01/DT/07/2023, 02/DT/07/2023, 03/DT/07/2023, 05/DT/07/2023, Location Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. At my site visit, I saw that development has been substantially completed on an alternative scheme; I have dealt with the appeal separately on its merits on the basis of the plans before me that were submitted with the application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupants of 50 Bannockburn Road having regard to outlook.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mid-terrace, two-storey dwelling in a residential area. The proposal is a single-storey rear addition that would project outwards by approximately 2.75m beyond the rear wall of a previously built rear infill extension, with its flank elevation lying about half a metre from the common boundary with 50 Bannockburn Road.

5. I acknowledge that the development would be higher than the existing boundary fence. However, the impact upon living conditions would be ameliorated by the gap to the flank border as shown on the plans, such that the built form would be partly screened by the existing rear infill extension, the side wall of which lies directly on the common boundary. To my mind, the arrangement would prevent the proposal from appearing oppressive and overbearing when viewed from the neighbour's facing window in the ground floor rear elevation of the main house.
6. The openings in the ground floor side wall of the two-storey outrigger to no.50 currently look out towards the flank elevation of the rear infill extension, and the scheme would not materially worsen the situation in this respect. The rear window to the outrigger of no.50 has a view over the rear garden that would not be adversely affected by the addition.
7. On this basis I am drawn to conclude that the scheme would not result in harm to the the living conditions of the occupants of 50 Bannockburn Road having regard to outlook. It would conform with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (July 2014) and the Council's Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance SPD (Dec 2018), which seek to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers.

Conditions

8. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty. A condition requiring external materials to match those on the existing dwelling would provide for a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to all matters before me, the appeal succeeds.

C Hall

INSPECTOR