



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2024

by N Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/23/3329981

53 Southend Crescent, Eltham, Greenwich SE9 2SD

- 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 Dorota Zielinska against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 23/2014/HD, dated 19 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension. Remove rear chimney stack. Solar panelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Revised versions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for the appeal. I have had regard to the latest version of the Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues raised by this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and area and the living conditions of the occupiers of No 51 Southend Crescent, particularly in regard of outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The proposed extension would be a tall and large addition. The ridge of the extension would project above the cills of the first floor windows. The height in combination with the length would create a bulky addition at the rear of this modestly sized semi-detached property. As such, it would not represent a sympathetic addition to the host property. Furthermore, other than an existing small lean-to structure the adjoining semi-detached property has not been extended at the rear. The proposal would have a visually unbalancing appearance when viewed in the context of both properties. Consequently, the proposal would be visually harmful.

5. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and area. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan, Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies and the Council's Residential Extensions, Conversions and Basement Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). These policies and SPD seek, amongst other matters, development to be of high quality design, to positively contribute to the improvement of both the built and natural environment, to respond to local distinctiveness and to be of a scale and character that respects the host building, the street scene and surrounding area.
6. I appreciate that the General Permitted Development Order may allow for a single storey extension to the rear of a dwelling. However, I have not been directed to such permitted development rights applying to the case before me and in any event I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits

Living conditions

7. The proposed extension would be within extremely close proximity to the common boundary of No 51 Southend Crescent. The occupiers of neighbouring properties should reasonably expect to enjoy an acceptable outlook as part of their residential lives. Given the height and length of the side elevation of the proposed rear extension this elevation would be extremely dominant in the outlook from the rear habitable living space within the property, as well as from the outdoor living space at the rear of the dwelling. This elevation in such close proximity to the adjoining property would diminish the enjoyment of the residential living environment for the neighbouring occupiers and would harm the enjoyment the existing occupiers should reasonably expect to enjoy.
8. The extension would also be positioned to the south of the adjoining property. There would be times during the day, and in particular those sunny days, when the proposed extension could cast a shadow and reduce daylight and/or sunlight to the adjoining property. However, this would be limited to a relatively short period of the day and would have less impact when the sun is high in the sky or when it is cloudy. Consequently, I do not consider the proposal would create significant harm in respect of light impacts.
9. Whilst I have found that the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 51 Southend Crescent with regard to light, for those reasons relating to outlook I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 51 Southend Crescent. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policy DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies. That policy seeks, amongst other matters, new development, including extensions and renovations, to demonstrate that there would be no significant loss of amenity to adjacent or nearby properties, by reducing the amount of daylight, sunlight, privacy or outlook they enjoy, or by creating an unneighbourly sense of enclosure.
10. The existence of other rear extensions in the locality, whether benefiting from planning permission or prior notification, do not justify the harm I have identified to the character and appearance and living conditions that would result from the proposed development. I acknowledge that that the proposal is intended to bring out the Edwardian character of the house. It would also provide a benefit of improved energy efficiency by including the installation of

solar panels. However, these matters do not overcome my above concerns or justify the proposal.

Other Matters

11. Some concern has been raised to the Council's handling of planning applications and communication with the applicant, now the appellant. However, these are matters that, if necessary, should be raised with the Council away from this appeal. In any event, these concerns would not lead me to alter my above findings.

Conclusion

12. Having regard to the above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR