

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2016

**by Philip Lewis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 11 October 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/16/3153891**

**11A Mallet Road, Hither Green, London SE13 6SP**

- 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 Mr Bal Bahra, Looplin Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
  - The application Ref DC/16/095939, dated 16 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2016.
  - The development proposed is described as proposed roof extension in a dormer form to the rear roof slope incorporating a Juliette balcony together with the installation of two rooflights to the front roof slope.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue for the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a first floor flat situated within a sub divided terraced dwelling, towards the end of a terrace, close to the junction of Mallet Road and Brightside Road. I saw at my site visit that the relatively steep pitched tiled roof is defined from that of its neighbours by side parapet party walls.
  4. The Councils adopted Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which was updated in May 2012, includes detailed guidance on roof extensions. The SPD sets out that all roof extensions should be sensitively designed to retain the architectural integrity of the building. It includes that rear roof extensions should be set back a minimum of one metre behind the lines of eaves and a minimum of 500mm from the gable, flank or party wall boundary and that materials used should be compatible with those existing.
  5. The proposed rear roof extension would span almost the full width of the roof, with set-back distances from the parapet party walls of about 100 mm and 200mm respectively and about 0.4 metres from the eaves. Whilst the appellant wishes to optimise the amount of available floorspace of the extension to provide accommodation and a rear roof extension may be the only feasible way to achieve it, the amount of set-back would be significantly below the figures set out in the SPD. Although the proposed extension would be set below the ridge line, it would dominate the rear roof of the building, obscuring
-

most of the existing roof and would not respect the architectural characteristics of the building. Therefore, the appeal proposal would give rise to significant harm to the character and appearance of the building. I saw at my site visit that the rear roof of the appeal building is prominent from Brightside Road. Consequently, the overly dominant rear roof extension would be visually obtrusive within the wider area.

6. The walls of the proposed extension would be finished in slatted timber cladding, which it has been stated would be black English cedar. Whilst I have little details before me to conclude whether the proposed material would be unobtrusive, were I to allow the appeal, this matter could be dealt with by way of a planning condition. I note that there is no dispute in respect of the proposed rooflights to the front of the building.
7. I conclude that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is contrary to Policy 15 of the Lewisham Local Development Framework, Core Strategy, Development Plan Document June 2011 which is concerned with high quality design. It also does not accord with the Lewisham Local Development Framework, Development Management Local Plan November 2014 (Local Plan) Policy DM30, which is concerned with urban design and character and Local Plan Policy DM31 which is concerned with alterations and extensions to existing buildings. Additionally the proposal does not accord with the guidance as set out in the SPD.

### **Other matters**

8. The appellant has referred to rear roof extensions at 2, 7A, 18 and 23 Mallet Road. In respect of 7A, I note from the plans provided that the rear roof extension meets the set-back distances as set out in the SPD. I understand that the rear roof extension at No 2 was built under permitted development rights and I saw at my site visit that it appears to have greater set back distances than proposed, but it nevertheless obscures much of the roof. I do not consider that it should provide an example of what should be followed given the harm found in this case. In respect of the extensions cited at Nos 18 and 23, I have been provided with few details and did not find them to be prominent in the street scene.
9. I have taken into consideration that the appeal property is not a listed building or in a Conservation Area and that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbours. I have also considered the policies of London Plan regarding lifetime neighbourhoods and architecture cited but these do not lead me to a different decision. I have taken into account the policies of National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) cited by the appellant. However, given the harm found to the character and appearance of the area, the appeal proposal is not sustainable development for which the Framework has a presumption.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons given above and having considered all matters raised, I consider that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Philip Lewis*

INSPECTOR