



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2025

**by Ryan Cowley MPlan (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 April 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/W/24/3354453**

**32 Ransom Road, Charlton, Greenwich SE7 8SR**

- 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 Khalid Qureshi against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
- The application Ref is 24/2542/F.
- The development proposed is part 1st floor rear extension and side and rear dormers to existing roof.

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on:
  - The character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area; and
  - The living conditions of the occupiers of 71 Floyd Road, with particular regard to outlook.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal building comprises an established mosque sitting adjacent to the footpath on Ransom Road. The surrounding area is predominantly characterised by rows of terraced dwellings, albeit the nearby stadium is a prominent feature in the locality. The site is bounded by a rail line on the opposite side, and there are several large trees to the rear.
4. The building is somewhat isolated in its siting and appearance, located along a short cul-de-sac off Floyd Road, detached and finished in a light colour render, in contrast to the brick finish prevalent on nearby terraces. 75 Floyd Road features a chamfered rear elevation, revealing the side elevation of the appeal building to the street. Dwellings on the opposite side of Ransom Road are also set back from the footpath along Harvey Gardens, providing a relatively unobstructed view of the building in views from the east. The site is thus prominent in the street scene.
5. The terraced dwellings at 67-75 Floyd Road feature short private rear gardens, which provide only a modest separation distance between the dwellings and the appeal building. The existing hipped roof design of the appeal building, which slopes away from the neighbouring dwellings, provides some relief from the dense arrangement of buildings along this part of the street.

6. The proposal includes an elongated dormer extension within the side facing roof slope, finished in grey slate hung tiles, with no windows. While dormer roof extensions are not uncommon locally, the blank elevations of the proposed side dormer would appear as an incongruous and obtrusive addition to the existing roof slope. This would further erode the limited space between the building and neighbouring dwellings and would appear out of keeping with its prevailing form and appearance. Given the elevated position of the dormer and its siting, it would be a conspicuous addition to the street scene.
7. The proposed rear facing dormer would also be a large and bulky addition, consuming a significant proportion of the existing rear roof slope. While it would benefit from windows, it would not be set down from the ridge of the existing roof and would be set back only modestly from the eaves. Due to its siting, it would be less conspicuous in the street scene along Ransom Road, Floyd Road and Harvey Gardens however it would still be prominent in views from passing trains and from the private and shared spaces to the rear of 67-75 Floyd Road. Taken as a whole, the proposals would give the building an ungainly and top-heavy appearance.
8. The proposal would thus have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan March 2021 and Policy DH1 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan Core Strategy with Detailed Policies Adopted 30 July 2014 (the Core Strategy). These policies, among other provisions, seek to ensure that all developments are of a high quality of design, and proposals positively respond to local distinctiveness, with due regard to building types, forms and proportions, and provide a positive relationship between the proposed and existing urban context, taking account of the architecture of surrounding buildings.

#### *Living conditions*

9. 67-75 Floyd Road are arranged somewhat unconventionally, with rear elevations facing at an oblique angle to front elevations. Rear facing windows in No 71 face towards the appeal site, and the rear garden space is modest. The outlook from No 71 is thus dominated by the tall and largely blank side elevation of the appeal building. The outlook from rear windows is further curtailed by the side wall of No 73, which projects a considerable distance beyond the rear of No 71. The single storey nature and flat roof design of the existing rear offshoot at the appeal building provide a degree of outlook in north facing views from No 71 and somewhat moderate its impact on No 71's rear garden.
10. The proposed first-floor extension would project above this existing rear offshoot. While the pitched roof of the extension would slope away from the side boundary, its eaves and ridge heights would match those of the existing building and the tall blank wall of the extension would run along the rear of much of No 71's garden.
11. While the appellant has sought to safeguard the privacy of neighbours, due to its scale and siting, the proposed extension would appear overbearing and oppressive from rear facing windows and the rear garden of No 71. It would exacerbate the existing sense of enclosure and have a significant deleterious effect on outlook for occupiers of this neighbouring property.
12. The proposal would thus have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 71 Floyd Road, with particular regard to outlook. It would conflict with Policy DH(b) of the Core Strategy. This policy seeks to ensure that extensions or

renovations of buildings are only permitted where it can be demonstrated that the proposed development does not cause unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers by reducing the amount of daylight, sunlight or privacy they enjoy or result in an unneighbourly sense of enclosure.

## **Conclusion**

13. The proposal would enhance an existing religious community facility, including by providing office space and an extended prayer hall. This would be a benefit that weighs in favour of the proposal, albeit in this case it would be insufficient to outweigh the significant harm and development plan conflict identified.
14. Other than where set out above, I have not identified conflict with any other relevant parts of the development plan or national policy and guidance. However, the absence of harm or development plan conflict with respect to other relevant matters weighs neither for nor against the proposal.
15. I recognise the rights of the appellant and of individuals who attend the mosque under Articles 8, 9 and 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights as incorporated into the Human Rights Act 1998. In exercising my function on behalf of a public authority, I have also had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in the Equality Act 2010. The relevant protected characteristics include religion or belief. Since there is the potential for my decision to affect persons with a protected characteristic, I have had due regard to the three equality principles set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.
16. Dismissal of the appeal would interfere with relevant Convention rights by preventing the expansion of the existing religious community facility. However, in this case this would be in accordance with the law and in pursuance of the protection of the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area in the public interest and the living conditions of others.
17. There is no evidence before me that dismissal of the appeal would harm the ability of individuals to continue to attend the mosque or practice their religion or belief. Given the identified harm and conflict with the development plan, I conclude that dismissal of the appeal is a proportionate and necessary response in this case.
18. The development conflicts with the development plan, taken as a whole. I have found no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

*Ryan Cowley*

INSPECTOR