
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2017

by David Walker MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21st April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/16/3162118

42 Davenport Road, Lewisham, London SE6 2AZ

- 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 S Cossar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/16/097428, dated 11 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with rear dormer and conversion into 2 two bed flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and
 - ii) whether the proposal would make adequate provision for movement and transportation.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is located mid-block in a street of traditional two storey houses. It is a wider than average building with a sizeable rear garden for the locale. While there is some variation in individual house design along the street ridged roofs are a determining characteristic of the area.
 4. Although the proposal would utilise materials to match the host building, the rear extension would extend across most of the width of the property and rise to a height approaching the ridge tiles. Wide windows with Juliette balconies would be out of proportion with the original openings of the property creating a top heavy effect that would jar with the traditional forms of adjacent dwellings.
 5. I acknowledge the two separated forms with a reduced height link would go some way to reduce the massing of the extension. However, the overall effect of the extension would be to obliterate the ridged roof form of the property. Front facing rooflights would also be atypical of the street but would be a minor alteration in comparison that would not lead to significant harm.
-

6. With a considerable number of properties located to the rear of the appeal site the proposal would be widely seen to be out of scale and character with the traditional roof forms of the area. It is scenario which differs from the appeal decision provided where an Inspector found a roof extension to be not widely visible. The effect would be compounded by the mid-block position of the host property with traditional roofs on both sides.
7. The retention of the existing chimneys and the two storey rear projection would help to retain some of the original character of the building but would not compensate for the prominent roof alterations. The degree to which the extension would be set in from the edge and flanks of the building would be insufficient to reduce the harm to an acceptable degree. It would not accord with the recommendations contained within the Council's supplementary design guidance.
8. On this issue I conclude that the rear extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with the requirements to respect context and achieve a high standard of design set out at Policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy 2011, policies DM Policy 30 and DM Policy 31 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan 2014, and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015.

Movement and transportation

9. An additional dwelling would be created that would generate additional travel demands from the occupants. The Council notes that the appeal site is located in an area generally well served by public transport and local facilities. In these circumstances additional car parking spaces would not be sought.
10. An indicative drawing provided by the appellant shows sufficient space within the rear garden for a cycle parking facility and suitable access. These would be necessary to overcome the second of the Council's two reasons for refusal. Such facilities as could reasonably be secured by a condition would bring this element of the proposal into accord with the cycle parking requirements of Policy 14 of the Lewisham Core Strategy 2011 and Policy 6.9 of the London Plan 2015 and its associated guidance.
11. There would be a further benefit from the provision of cycle spaces for the existing accommodation where none exists at present. However, while I find the proposal to be acceptable in this regard it would not outweigh the harm I have identified in relation to character and appearance.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Walker

INSPECTOR