

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2016

by Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 3rd October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/16/3156203

62 Sevenoaks Road, Crofton Park, London SE4 1RE

- 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 Kate Malone against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/16/096413, dated 27 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a part single storey, part two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Sevenoaks Road is a predominately residential street comprising small rows of two-storey terraced properties. The terraces share a common architectural style with each row being bookended by gable fronted properties. The original form of the properties on the street has largely been retained with no significant additions to front and side elevations. Generally the terraced rows have narrow spacing between them although the row which the appeal property forms part of is an exception to this having a much wider gap. The properties are set back from the highway with driveways and gardens to the front, which contribute to the overall spaciousness of the area.
 4. Overall, the character and appearance of the road is typified by the regularity of the design and scale of the properties, their uniform building line and its spaciousness.
 5. The appeal property is a gable fronted end terrace in a row of four dwellings. The extension would be located on the side elevation and would occupy a large portion of the gap with the neighbouring property, No 60 Sevenoaks Road.
 6. The extension would have a two-storey element to the front providing an extension to an existing bedroom. Although described as two-storey, it would provide limited headroom at first floor and would appear as one and a half storeys in height. The remaining part of the extension would be single-storey.
-

7. The angle of the roof of the extension would match that of the host dwelling. Whilst I appreciate that this has been informed by the design detail of corner properties on the road, they play a different role in the street scene by defining the corners and have dual aspects embracing their adjacent roads. As a result of the height of the roof, the extension would interrupt the uniform roofscape of the terraced properties, failing to respect the bookend role the host property plays in defining the end of the row.
8. Furthermore, the front elevation of the extension would fail to respect the existing proportions of the dwelling, having a large expanse of blank elevation above the ground floor window, appearing excessively bulky. I appreciate that the use of different materials would attempt to address this and replicate the use of contrasting materials on the existing dwelling. However, the introduction of further materials would only serve to highlight the incongruity of the extension. Consequently, the adverse effect it would have on the host dwelling would significantly harm the symmetry of the row of terraces and the overall character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. I have had regard to the fallback position of a single-storey extension that could be constructed under permitted development rights. However, I do not consider that such a proposal would be as substantial as the proposal before me and would unlikely to appear as incongruous as the two-storey element. With regard to the effect on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupants, the reduced impact the proposed development would have compared to what could be constructed under permitted development rights does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
10. I find therefore that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011 and Policies 30 and 31 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan, which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development is of a high standard of design and that extensions should respect the form of the original building and should not affect the architectural integrity of a group of buildings. Furthermore, it would fail to accord with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, which seek to ensure that development provides a high quality design and comprises details and materials that complement the local architectural character. In addition, it would also fail to comply with the Lewisham Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document, which provides guidance on residential extensions.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR