



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2025

by Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/24/3352538

67 Eglinton Road, Woolwich, SE18 3SL

- 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 Ms R Hayles against the decision of the Royal Borough of Greenwich Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/2062/HD.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey lower ground floor part side infill and rear wrap-around extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are: i) the effect of the lower ground floor extension on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers at 69/69A Eglinton Road; and ii) the effect of that extension on the character of the host dwelling and the pattern of development in the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on the north-western side of Eglinton Road and comprises a 3 storey mid-terraced dwelling with basement accommodation. The basement is only apparent as such at the front, where the basement level is reached by steps down from road level. At the rear, the land form means that the basement becomes the 'lower ground floor' at the same level as the rear garden.
4. The appeal dwelling was originally built with a rear gable roofed outrigger, at lower ground and ground floor levels, as are its neighbours. The outrigger of the subject property is attached to the neighbour at No.65, so that the outrigger of No.69/69A is built away from the common boundary, alongside that of No.71. In addition, the appeal house has a single storey outbuilding on the back of the outrigger, and a conservatory infilling most of the space between the outrigger and the boundary with No.69/69A.

The effect of the lower ground floor extension on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers at 69/69A Eglinton Road

5. The present situation is that the conservatory has a depth of 3.7m and a height at the boundary fence of some 2.5m. The proposal is that there would be an open courtyard immediately at the back of the host dwelling, extending about 1.4m, and

separated from No.69/69A by a wall 1.93m high. Beyond this courtyard, the proposed extension would have a depth into the garden area of 5.73m, meaning that the total length of the wall on the boundary would be a little over 7m.

6. This extension has been designed to minimise the effect on the neighbour. It has a flat roof across the back of the outrigger, and then a mono-pitch roof falling towards the No.69/69A boundary and finishing with a short flat roof, so that at the boundary the height is 2.5m. The boundary fence between these 2 dwellings appears to be about the normal 1.8m high. Thus for the most part, the new wall would be 0.7m above the normal fence height.
7. The greatest effect of the proposal on No.69/69A would be in the narrow area between the curtilage boundary and 69/69A's outrigger. The depth of that outrigger appears to be approximately 4.25m. There is a door and windows in the flank of No.69/69A's outrigger and the back of the dwelling, but there would be little change in the amount of sunlight daylight that would reach these due to the appeal proposal, compared with the present situation. However, the proposed extension would be more substantial than the present conservatory, in solid brickwork, most of it 2.5m high. Taken as a whole, the appeal proposal would bring a structure on the boundary of the 2 houses more than 7m long. That would be both a visual intrusion and one that would be oppressive and unneighbourly.

The effect of the lower ground floor extension on the character of the host dwelling and the pattern of development in the area

8. Policy DH(a) of the council's Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (adopted July 2014) states that residential extensions should be limited to a scale appropriate to the host building and the locality and should be designed to respect the established pattern of development. Principle I.3.3 of the RBG Urban Design Guidance SPD (2023) (SPD) relates to rear extensions and sets out that all rear extensions are required to respond appropriately to the scale of the existing building and the size of the garden. This principle also sets out that a 3.6m projection from the rear is typically considered appropriate in Royal Greenwich. With regard to roof forms for single storey rear extensions, section i.91 of the SPD sets out that a flat roof form is generally preferred as it helps to reduce the overall bulk and impact of the extension. The SPD does go on to state at section i.92 that other roof forms can be considered.
9. Whilst the design of the proposal has sought to minimise the effect on the neighbour, by articulating the roof levels down from the main flat roof, the fact remains that the proposal is a very substantial addition that would not sit well with the form and mass of the existing dwelling. I conclude that the proposed lower ground floor extension would have a harmful effect on the character of the host dwelling and the pattern of development in the area sufficient to warrant refusal under the terms of Policy DH(a) and the SPD.

Conclusion

10. I can appreciate the benefits that the proposal would bring to the appellant and family, but this should not be at the expense of a reduction in the amenity of neighbours or an addition that would be detrimental to the character of the dwelling and the area. I also accept that these houses have reasonably good sized rear gardens and a substantial part of the neighbour's garden would not be enclosed by

the extension. I also recognise that there is an open staircase at the back of the outrigger of No.69/69A that intrudes into the open area. But none of these matters changes the balance of the planning decision.

11. For the reasons that I have set out above, the appeal will be dismissed.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR