

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2016

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/16/3160139
57 Further Green Road, London SE6 1JG

- 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 Jaswant Nandhra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/16/096480 was refused by notice dated 30 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion including space over existing side extension together with a first floor rear extension built above existing ground floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mainly 2-storey end terrace house that lies within a predominantly residential area. Properties along Further Green Road, in the vicinity of the site, are broadly similar in age and style, with those at the end of terraces mostly with hipped roofs. Like some other nearby dwellings, No 57 has been extended and externally altered. Consequently, there is some variety to the existing built form in the local street scene to which No 57 belongs.
 4. The proposal is to enlarge the appeal dwelling with a new first floor addition at the rear, a hip to gable extension and a new dormer on the extended rear roof slope. The latter would be a sizeable addition covering most of the existing and new rear roof slope. The considerable width and height of the proposed dormer, with its flat roof set just below ridge level, would cause it to appear as an overly large 'box like' addition. The considerable scale and bulk of the new dormer would give the finished building an awkward top-heavy appearance, which would detract from its intrinsic character even on the extended rear roof slope and with the new first floor rear addition in place. This would be evident from the rears of some neighbouring properties. Whilst there are a number of rear dormers in the vicinity of the site, including those to which the appellant has referred, these clearly demonstrate the intrusive appearance of such extensions and do not in my opinion justify a further example.
-

5. The crown roof of the proposed first floor extension is not a feature of the host building. It would result in an awkward juxtaposition of different roof shapes in the new rear elevation with flat, crown and pitched roofs all evident across the three floor levels. The depth of the new rear extension, when taken together with the existing single storey addition below, would also be considerable for a 2-storey projection. The main outcome would be an overly large and bulky rear projection that would be visually dominant and an unsympathetic addition that would relate poorly to the architectural style of the dwelling.
6. Three new roof lights would be placed at a high level on the front roof slope, as extended, which would appear excessive in number from the road. As a result, these features would draw the eye in the street scene even among the varied built form that characterises this section of Further Green Road. Consequently, I am unable to share the appellant's opinion that the public realm would remain undisturbed or that the proposal would have nil effect.
7. According to the Council, its Supplementary Planning Document, *Residential Standards* (SPD) states that roof alterations should be subordinate to the principal elevations. The Council also notes that the new dormer would not achieve the required set backs that are advised in the SPD other than in relation to the flank elevation. On that basis, the proposal would not adhere to the guidance contained within the SPD as the appellant suggests.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. It states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area. For the reasons given, that would be the case with the proposal before me. In reaching this conclusion, I have taken into account the proposed use of external materials to match the existing building. I also acknowledge that there is no presumption in principle against extensions to form gable ends.
9. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan, Policy 15 of the Council's Core Strategy and DM Policies 30 and 31 of the Development Management Local Plan. These policies seek to ensure that development achieves a high standard of design, respects the form of the original building and complements local character.
10. The proposal would provide additional living accommodation that would improve the living conditions of the appellant and family. However, this consideration does not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

11. Overall, for the reasons set out above, and taking into account the absence of objections from others, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR