

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: 13 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/16/3155595

9 Princes Rise, Blackheath, London SE13 7PP

- 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 D Karatas against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/16/096609, dated 11 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I note the amended description of the proposal omitting the reference to the rear dormer window. My description in the above banner heading reflects this and I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Princes Rise is a predominantly residential road comprising a variety of properties in terms of size and architectural style. Properties on the road generally form small groupings of several buildings that share a common architectural style. The appeal property is a mid-20th century two-storey, end terrace dwelling in a row of three such dwellings on the east side of Princes Road. A similar row of three properties are located further to the south, separated from the appeal site by two pairs of semi-detached properties that are of a similar period but differ in their design. With the exception of a single storey side extension on one of the terraced properties to the south, the front elevations of both groups of terraces generally retain their original form.
 5. The proposed two-storey extension would continue the existing ridgeline and its front and rear elevations would be a continuation of the dwellings existing elevations. Whilst following the existing form of the dwelling and only being relatively narrow in width, the extension would visually unbalance the symmetry of this small terrace to the detriment of its character and appearance. The lack of a set-back elevation and ridgeline would result in the
-

extension failing to appear subordinate to the host dwelling and there would be no break between the original building and the extension, contrary to Policy 31 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan (DMLP) 2014 and the guidance contained within Lewisham Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

6. I have had regard to the appellant's argument that an integrated approach is an acceptable form of development, which is supported by other London boroughs. Whilst I agree that an integrated approach can be acceptable in some circumstances, in this instance, as I have found above, the proposal would harm the balanced proportions of the small terrace.
7. I have also had regard to the appellant's contention that a single storey side extension could be constructed under permitted development rights. However, in my view such an extension would have a lower ridge height than that currently proposed and therefore would likely appear subordinate and would not disrupt the balance of the terrace.
8. I find therefore that the extension would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. As such, it would be contrary to Policies 30 and 31 of the DMLP, which seek to ensure that development is of a high standard of design and extensions should respect the form of the original building. Furthermore, it would fail to comply with Policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011, which seeks to ensure that development is of a high quality design. In addition, it would fail to accord with the guidance contained within the SPD.

Conclusion

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

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR