



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2025

by **A Wright BSc (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3347926

12 Wrotesley Road, Plumstead, Greenwich SE18 3EP

- 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 Amarjeet Singh against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref is 24/0613/HD.
 - The development proposed is a rear two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 10 and 14 Wrotesley Road, with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey end terraced dwelling within a residential area. The other buildings in the terrace have rear outriggers but there is not a similar rear projection on the appeal property. Most dwellings in the terrace have pitched roofs with no roof additions, though there is a dormer on the rear of the appeal property. The neighbouring semi-detached house at 14 Wrotesley Road (No 14) has side and rear extensions which extend significantly beyond the existing structure on the appeal site.
4. The proposal is for a part two storey pitched roof rear extension with a single storey flat roof extension beyond, with finishes to match the house. The Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2022 (SPD) requires the scale, bulk and massing of any double storey extension to be carefully considered so that it does not overwhelm the existing building. This can be achieved by maintaining appropriate distances between the extension roof and the eaves and reducing the width of the extension to half the plot width, amongst other things.
5. The roof ridges of the conjoined outriggers at 8 and 10 Wrotesley Road (Nos 8 and 10) broadly align with the eaves of those houses. Due to their sloping roof profiles, the outrigger eaves are substantially below the height of the house eaves.

In contrast, the proposed two storey addition would project above the eaves of the existing house, extending around the existing rear dormer and creating an ungainly, disjointed roof arrangement. As such, the proposal would be a discordant addition to the appeal property and terrace.

6. The proposed development would not extend as far as the neighbouring outriggers and would have a similar width to them. Therefore, the depth and width of the proposed extension would not be harmfully out of scale with the existing townscape in this case. However, due to its height, the two-storey addition would occupy a large amount of the existing dwelling's rear face and extend into its roof. As a result, the proposal would be a dominant and bulky addition, failing to appear subservient to the existing building.
7. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 (LP) and Policies DH1 and DH(a) of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014 (CSDP). Amongst other things, these require developments to be of a high quality design and to take account of spatial character, with extensions required to be of a scale and design appropriate to the building and locality.

Living conditions

8. The large rear outrigger on the adjoining dwelling at No 10 is located only a small distance from the appeal site boundary. It includes ground and upper floor room windows facing the site. This property additionally has rear ground and first floor windows facing into the area beside the outrigger. The other neighbouring house at No 14 also has a flank window facing into the appeal site, albeit the appellant questions whether this complies with building regulation requirements.
9. The SPD requires extensions to not significantly overshadow windows to neighbouring habitable rooms nor have a significant impact on daylight received. In this respect, it requires proposals for two-storey rear extensions to assess the impact on sunlight and daylight to neighbouring properties using the BRE's Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight guidance. The SPD also outlines that extensions which create an unacceptable sense of enclosure or dominate principal views from neighbouring windows are unlikely to be granted planning permission.
10. The proposed development would be located to the south of No 10, close to the mutual boundary with the adjoining house. Although it would not extend as far as the neighbouring outrigger, the height, projection and siting of the proposed extension would result in significant enclosure of the areas to the rear of No 10 and adjacent to No 14. It would dominate the outlook from the side outrigger windows and the rear openings beside the outrigger at No 10 and from the flank window at No 14, adversely affecting the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers when using these rooms, which include a dining room and bedrooms.
11. The Council and the appellant do not dispute that the scheme would not cause a harmful loss of light to the occupiers of No 14. However, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the scale and position of the proposed extension, and its orientation relative to the adjoining house, would result in a harmful loss of sunlight and daylight to rear rooms at No 10.

12. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would harm the outlook from 10 and 14 Wrottesley Road. It would also cause an unacceptable loss of light to No 10. This would conflict with Policy D3 of the LP and Policy DH(b) of the CSDP. Together, these require developments to not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers by reducing the amount of daylight or sunlight they enjoy or result in an unneighbourly sense of enclosure, amongst other things.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

A Wright

INSPECTOR