

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2016

by Claire Victory BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/16/3157145

8 Sandrock Road, Lewisham, London SE13 7TR

- 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 Alister Cornwall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/15/92899, dated 23 July 2015, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2016.
 - The development proposed is a conversion including loft space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey building with a lower ground floor, and a two storey return to the rear. The proposal would retain the roof ridge line and the chimney stack. However, whilst it would be set about 0.7m away from the eaves of the two storey rear return, it would be built up to the party wall and would extend the full depth of the return. Furthermore, it would be set into the main roof slope and would be higher than the eaves level of the main roof. The excessive size and scale would not be sympathetic to the proportions of the original building, contrary to Policy DM31 of the Development Management Local Plan (DMLP) (2014).
 4. There are no public views of the development. Nonetheless, due to its size and scale it would appear as a discordant and dominant feature within the rear garden environment when viewed from surrounding properties on Sandrock Road and Loampit Hill. The imposition of a condition requiring the use of matching materials would not mitigate the visual impact of the proposal.
 5. There are a small number of rear roof extensions on the western side of Sandrock Road, but only one is within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site at No 6. The rear extension at No 6 has some similarities to the appeal proposal, but does not extend the full depth of the return and is therefore materially smaller than the scheme before me. Moreover, the aforementioned
-

extension was built as permitted development¹ and the Council has stated that 11 of the 14 buildings within the subject terrace have been converted to flats. Consequently changes to the character of the subject terrace arising from roof extensions can be largely managed through the development control process.

6. The appellant points out that DMLP Policy DM31 criterion 2b) states "*roof extensions on the street frontage of a building particularly in a residential street will be resisted in favour of extensions to the rear of the building*". Nonetheless, the conflict with Policy DM31 as a whole that I have identified would outweigh the in-principle support for rear roof extensions in preference to those on the front elevation of properties that forms just one constituent part of the policy. Accordingly, this would not alter my overall conclusion.
7. Taking all of the above into account I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to the design objectives of Policy 15 of the Core Strategy (2011), and DMLP Policies DM30 and DM31. These policies are consistent with the Framework, insofar as it requires a high standard of design in all new development.
8. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Claire Victory

INSPECTOR

¹ DC/13/85127 – Certificate of Lawful Development (proposed)