
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2016

by David Cliff BA Hons MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/16/3157707

2 Border Road, London SE26 6HB

- 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 Frances Brooker against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/15/094601, dated 25 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear and side extension at 2 Border Road, London SE26 6HB in accordance with the terms of the application DC/15/094601, dated 25 November 2015, and 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: 2BORDRD/P1 and 2BORDRD/P2 (received by the Council on 17th May 2016).
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 4. The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the local planning authority.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mrs Frances Brooker against the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Procedural Matter

3. During the course of the Council's consideration of the application, amended plans were submitted by the applicant showing an increase in height of the existing garage and the addition of a pitched roof to the front. The Council's

decision is based on these amended drawings and my decision is also based upon them.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The existing property has an existing attached flat roofed side garage projection. The streetscene in the vicinity of the site includes residential development of a variety of designs and forms, including some properties with single storey side extensions. The attached property, comprising flats, has a two storey flat roofed side extension which has affected the proportion and symmetry of this pair of properties within the streetscene.
6. Whilst the proposal would contain only minimal detailing on its side elevation and would be of a substantial depth, its full extent would be partially screened within the streetscene and it would be set against the two storey side elevation of the existing dwellinghouse. Being single storey in height and with a lower ground level than the adjacent property (4 Border Road), I do not consider that it would appear as being unacceptably incongruous or detrimental to the appearance of the existing property.
7. The proposed development would be flush with the main front elevation of the property, and would be higher than the existing garage. Nevertheless, being single storey in height and incorporating a small front roof pitch, I consider that the proposal would appear as being satisfactorily subservient to the existing building. The use of matching materials would also help to assimilate it with the existing building.
8. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would satisfactorily accord with the relevant design aims of policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy 2011, DM policies 30 and 31 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan 2014, the Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.
9. An approved plans condition is necessary to provide certainty to what has been approved. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. In addition, a condition limiting the use of the roof of the extension is necessary in order to ensure that any future proposals for its use as a balcony/amenity area can be properly assessed in terms of the effects upon the privacy of neighbouring properties.
10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Cliff

INSPECTOR