
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2017

by Elaine Gray MA(Hons) MSc IHBC

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

Decision date: 05 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/16/3161822
58 Pepys Road, Lewisham, London SE14 5SD

- 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 Hasim Riza against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/16/096350, dated 12 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension with pitched roof.
-

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 conservation area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area (CA). The CA is primarily characterised by terraced and semi-detached housing which appears to date predominantly from the later 19th century. The Council's document entitled 'Telegraph Hill conservation area character appraisal' ('the appraisal', March 2008) identifies the regularity of the street pattern and the consistency of the building lines as being amongst the CA's most strongly defining features. Interspersed amongst the residential areas are other land uses such as schools and places of worship, and open spaces such as Telegraph Hill Park.
 4. The property at 58 Pepys Road is a semi-detached building which sits on the corner of the junction between Pepys Road and Sherwin Road. It has a number of features that are typical of the area, including prominent bay windows and a decorative door surround. Its traditional design and appearance make a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.
 5. The appraisal states that there are good views of the backs of houses, which are as uniform in design as the fronts. Sherwin Road is highlighted as an example of where such views may be achieved. In this corner location, the upper section of the proposed single storey rear extension would be visible to public view from Sherwin Road. Part of the garden wall would be replaced by the side elevation of the new extension, which would rise to a maximum height of around 1.2m above the garden wall.
-

6. I observed on my site visit that the rear elevations of No 58 and the adjoining properties to the south are characterised by three storey gable ends with bay windows on the first floors, and single windows on the second floors. This pattern repeats regularly along the rear elevations. The proposed extension would project forward from the rear elevation of No 58, thus breaking the established building line of the gables. It would disrupt the symmetry of the gable, and would appear at odds with its prevailing form. The development would wrap awkwardly around the first floor bay window, thus detracting from its distinctive form and its contribution to the architectural interest of the CA.
7. I accept that the proposed materials would generally match those of the existing building. However, the proposed roofing material is not specified on the plans, although the appellant states that it would match the existing slate roofing at No 58. Three rooflights are proposed within the new roof slope. Whilst the appellant states that these would be of a conservation type, I saw that rooflights at ground floor level are not typical in the vicinity. By virtue of their number and visible location, I am concerned that the proposed rooflights would dominate the new roof, and would detract from the architectural qualities of No 58.
8. Drawing these factors together, I find that the proposal would unacceptably harm the appearance of No 58 and its contribution to the architectural significance of the CA. In conclusion on this issue, I have had regard to the requirements under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. In this case, I consider that the development would have an adverse effect on the conservation area, and to that extent would fail to preserve its character or appearance. It would thus be at odds with Policies 15 and 16 of the Lewisham Core Strategy Development Plan Document (June 2011), insofar as they jointly seek to conserve heritage assets.
9. Whilst the harm to the significance of the conservation area would be less than substantial (in terms of the phraseology used in the National Planning Policy Framework), this does not mean that the harm would not be significant. The appellant states that the extension would be constructed to a good standard, and would accord with the latest energy and sustainability requirements. However, these would represent private benefits. I therefore conclude that insufficient evidence has been provided in relation to public benefits that would outweigh the harm to the CA.
10. For the reasons above, and taking all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Gray

INSPECTOR