
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 May 2017

by S Jones MA DipLP

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

Decision date: 4 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/17/3168957
77 Foxberry Road, London SE4 2SR

- 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 R Sargent, Marblefloor Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/16/099177, dated 17 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is construction of an additional storey to provide 1 x one bedroom flat.
-

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 surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The property is a suburban detached 1950s style white rendered flat roofed 2 storey building converted into flats. The proposal is to add a further third storey incorporating a one bedroom flat with a recessed balcony area in matching materials, flat roof and white render treatment.
 4. The current building is not unpleasant in character, but it does represent a noticeable anomaly within an area of predominantly 2 storey Victorian terraces, more so because of its prominence on the corner of the dogleg of Foxberry Road.
 5. The proposed development has been carefully designed with adequate space to respect the architectural integrity of the host building, and mimic its appearance. However, the addition of a further third flat roofed white rendered storey will raise its profile still further and give rise to a built form that would appear incongruous and obtrusive to an unacceptable degree within the existing area.
 6. Consequently its character and appearance conflict with Policy 15 of the 2011 Lewisham Core Strategy in its aims of securing high quality design where development should add coherence to the streetscene. It also conflicts with Policies DM30 and DM31 of the 2014 Lewisham Development Management
-

Local Plan and the 2012 Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Standards by failing to complement the surrounding area and make a positive contribution to the existing urban grain, townscape and roofscape by compounding its prominence and dissonant effect. I consider these policies collectively appear consistent in their aims with the 2012 National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

7. I note the emphasis on increasing available housing, however it is accepted that the Council can show a 5 year supply of housing, and so the addition of a one bedroom flat is not significant within that context. There is adequate space in the design, a recessed balcony that might function for cycle storage, and access to a range of transport options including public transport, but these are not sufficient material considerations to overcome the difficulties outlined and the conflict with policy.
8. Despite a neighbour's objection there is no reason to find that the scheme would detract from neighbours living conditions in terms of loss of light or outlook.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters, the appeal is dismissed.

S Jones

INSPECTOR