
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2017

by Harold Stephens BA MPhil DipTP MRTPI FRSA

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

Decision date: 13 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/16/3160834
37 Marischal Road, London SE13 5LE

- 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 Ms Tracey Warren against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/16/096629, dated 13 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a rear roof extension with associated roof lights, conversion of a garage to habitable room and alterations to the front elevation of 37 Marischal Road, SE13.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the Lewisham Town Centre area. It comprises an extended two storey semi-detached dwelling and is located on the northern side of Marischal Road. The surrounding area contains a mixture of single dwellings and residential flats in addition to commercial uses. The adjoining properties, situated to the east and west of the appeal site are also semi-detached dwellings and are of a similar design. The appeal property is not a listed building and is not located within a Conservation Area.
 4. The appeal proposal involves the construction of an extension to the roof and the conversion of the garage to a habitable room. The proposed roof extension would involve a substantial change to the existing roof profile by increasing the length of the ridge of the roof (when viewed from the street) by 2.3m and the installation of one front and one rear facing skylight window. At the rear roof slope, it is proposed to create an extension so as to provide two additional bedrooms with ensuite bathrooms within the extended roof space area.
 5. I note that the rear roof extension would be made up of two forms. One would be a sloped roof projection and the other would be an adjoining flat roof box dormer. According to the Council the extensions would have a maximum height of 3004mm, depth of 4199mm and width of 7500mm.
-

6. The statutory development plan for Lewisham comprises the Core Strategy (2011), together with the Site Allocations Local Plan (2013), the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan (2014), the Development Management Local Plan (2014) and the London Plan (2011/2016). The Core Strategy was adopted in 2011 and having reviewed its policies, I consider there is no issue of significant conflict with the NPPF¹ and as such full weight can be given to these policies in accordance with paragraph 215 of the NPPF.
7. Relevant policies in the London Plan include: Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential and Table 3.1; Policy 3.5 Quality and Design of Housing developments and Table 3.3 and Policy 3.8 Housing Choice. Relevant policies in the Core Strategy include: Spatial Policy 1- Lewisham Spatial Strategy; Spatial Policy 5- Areas of Stability and Managed Change; Core Strategy Policy 8 - Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency and Core Policy 15- High Quality design for Lewisham. Relevant Development Management Local Plan policies include: DM Policy 1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development; DM Policy 22 Sustainable design and construction; DM Policy 30 Urban Design and local character; DM Policy 31 Alterations/extensions to existing buildings and DM Policy 32 Housing design, layout and space standards. I have also taken into account the Residential Standards SPD (2006) updated in 2012.
8. At my site visit I saw that the appeal dwelling is set back and elevated above the existing road level. I also saw that the proposed roof extension would be constructed up to one of the flank walls and set off 500mm of the other. The dormers would be set back 850mm from the extended rear eaves line. Therefore the proposal would conflict with the design controls set out in the Residential Standards SPD.² In my view, the scale, mass and design of the roof extension would be overly dominant and not subordinate to the host dwelling. The form of the roof would be lost beneath the proposed extension. Moreover, the proposed increase to the width of the ridge line would have a significant impact upon the immediate street scene.
9. Furthermore, as the appeal dwelling is part of a semi-detached pair, the proposed alterations would materially unbalance the symmetry and detract from the character of the pair of properties. The proposal would be visible from the public realm and appear as an incongruous and unsympathetic addition in the street scene to the detriment of the local character of the area. I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to the aforementioned development plan policies notably Policy 15 of the Core Strategy, DM Policy 30, DM Policy 31 and the SPD. The proposal is in overall conflict with the development plan. On the main issue I conclude that the appeal must fail.
10. I have taken into account all other matters raised. I am aware that the proposal does not involve an increase in the height of the ridge line and would not adversely impact on the privacy or daylight of neighbours. Planning conditions would not overcome the objections I have described. None of these matters changes my overall conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed.

Harold Stephens

INSPECTOR

¹ National Planning Policy Framework

² Page 27 bullet point 7