
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2016

by David Walker MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/16/3152475

First Floor Flat, 21B Farren Road, London SE23 2DZ

- 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 T Uthayakanthan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/15/094252, dated 18 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion, rear dormer and new front elevation with roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion, rear dormer and new front elevation with roof lights at First Floor Flat, 21B Farren Road, London SE23 2DZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/15/094252, dated 18 October 2015, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 5760/001; 5760/002; 5760/003; 5760/004; 5760/005; 5760/006; 5760/007; 5760/008; 5760/009; 5760/0010; 5760/0011; 5760/0012; 5760/0013; 5760/0014; 5760/0015; 5760/0016; 5760/0017; and 5760/0018.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the windows and external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposed works have already been carried out and include the formation of a gable over the existing hip roof, and a new rear facing dormer window. They would facilitate the provision of an additional bedroom to the existing first floor flat. Only the form of the roof enlargement has given rise to the Council's reason for refusal.
-

4. Farren Road is a residential street with predominately two storey houses in varying house types and architectural styles. The host property, No 21, is one of a pair of matching semi-detached houses positioned adjacent to another matching pair, with both pairs featuring hipped roof forms.
5. However, gable roof forms are otherwise an existing characteristic of the street. In particular, a similar roof form to the proposal exists at No 23 immediately adjacent to the appeal building. This breaks the symmetry of the terrace within which it is located and presents a gable towards No 21. In this context the addition of the gable over the existing hip at the appeal building does not appear incongruous or out of character.
6. While No 21 can be seen as falling within two symmetrical pairs of houses in views along Treviso Road, I find this to be secondary street scene obtained from along a side road. In principal views along Farren Road the gable roof form of the proposal is subsumed within the general mass of the existing roofscape of the street. With matching materials as can be secured by condition I am satisfied that the proposal accords with the design guidance for roof extensions contained within the Lewisham Residential Standards 2012 supplementary planning document.
7. I therefore find the proposal to have a satisfactory effect on the character and appearance of the area. On this basis the design criteria contained within Policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011, and within DM Policy 30 and DM Policy 31 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan 2014, are complied with.
8. The appeal being allowed I have had regard to the suggested conditions provided by the Council. The standard time period for implementation and plans approved conditions are attached in the interests of certainty. I also attach a condition requiring matching materials to ensure that a high design quality is delivered.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

David Walker

INSPECTOR