



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2024

**by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 07 January 2025**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/22/3312774**

### **116 Macoma Road, Plumstead, Greenwich, London SE18 2QL**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Richard Dunn against the decision of Royal Borough of Greenwich.
  - The application Ref is 22/2430/HD dated 18 July 2022 was refused by notice dated 14 September 2022.
  - The development proposed is the "Erection of a single storey rear infill extension."
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single storey rear infill extension at 116 Macoma Road, Plumstead, Greenwich, London SE18 2QL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/2430/HD, dated 20 August 2018, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
  - i. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - ii. 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.
  - iii. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2206-116MR-001 Rev A, 2206-116MR-002 Rev A, 2206-116MR-003 Rev A, 2206-116MR-004 Rev A, 2206-116MR-005 Rev A, 2206-116MR-006 Rev A, 2206-116MR-007 Rev A and 2206-116MR-008 Rev A.
  - iv. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows other than the roof-light windows expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed on the 'side 1' elevation facing towards No 118 Macoma Road.

### **Main Issue**

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on living conditions for neighbouring occupiers at No 118 Macoma Road with respect to outlook.

### **Reasons**

3. The appeal site is a terraced property in a tight-knit part of London. At the rear there is a traditional 2-storey outrigger extension which is conjoined to a similar outrigger at the rear of No 114. There is a gap between the 2 storey part of the building and the boundary with No 118, although there is an existing short lean-to with a door leading into the garden. The rear outriggers are a feature of

the houses in this terrace and on the other side of the high boundary fence, No 118 also has similar gap and then a similar outrigger. The higher part of a substantial boundary fence extends beyond the rear building-line of the outriggers. I could see across the lower part of the boundary fence further into the garden, that the higher part of the fence is higher than the ground floor windows and door in the rear and side of the dwelling at No 118.

4. The proposal would involve replacing the small existing lean-to with an infill-extension that would have a pitched roof, leaning against the whole of the side wall of the outrigger and would cover the currently open area up to the garden at the back of the plot. The roof of the extension would slope down to the boundary with No 118 with the flank-wall shown just inside and with the eaves and gutter close-to the boundary. The flank wall of the proposal would be a similar height as the existing fence, there are no windows proposed in that elevation and it would have a similar enclosing effect as the current fence.
5. The occupants of No 118 would look out from side and rear windows as well as the partly glazed door, onto a different but nevertheless similar sized boundary structure. The roof sloping up but away from the boundary would have little additional effect on any sense of enclosure or impact upon outlook even though the ground level at No 118 is a little lower than the appeal site. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document<sup>1</sup> (SPD) discourages side extensions over 3.6m deep from the rear of the dwelling because it says that they are likely to restrict light. The total length of the extension would be 6.87m from the rear elevation of the dwelling but no harm is suggested would occur due to any loss of daylight or sunlight which the SPD seeks to prevent.
6. In relation to the main issue, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on living conditions for neighbouring occupiers at No 118 Macoma Road with respect to outlook. The development would not cause any unacceptable harm or loss of amenity for those adjoining occupiers and as such, this would comply with Policy DH(b) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies, adopted 30 July 2014. For the above reasons, the aims of the SPD would be achieved.

### **Planning Conditions**

7. A condition is required in order to prevent the insertion of windows without planning permission, in the side elevation of the extension which would be very close to the boundary with No 118 and thereby safeguard the privacy of those neighbouring occupiers. The standard conditions regarding the time-limit for implementation, use of matching materials and compliance with the approved plans are also imposed.

### **Conclusion**

8. Accordingly, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal complies with the development plan as a whole and that the appeal should succeed.

*Andy Harwood*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance, December 2018