

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2017

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) MCD DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/17/3173694
170 Bellingham Road, Catford SE6 1EJ

- 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 Kenn Saggars against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/16/099622, dated 23 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is:-
 1. Remodelling of the existing main roof to extend bedroom 2 with introduction of a single skylight to the front
 2. Ground floor rear extension to provide new boiler room with side window and side door
 3. First floor rear extension above existing play area to provide new bedroom 3
 4. First floor rear extension above existing kitchen and new boiler room to provide new bedroom 4
 5. Remodelling of the existing smaller side roof to provide new shower
 6. Introduction of three skylights to provide reasonable level of daylight.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The description of the proposed works on the application form further comments about the amendments made to address appeal decision Ref: APP/C5690/W/16/3147702.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

3. I consider that the main issues are the effect of the proposal on (1) the character and appearance of the area; and (2) the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The proposed extensions follow on from a previous scheme that was dismissed on appeal¹ and the appellant has described the differences between the earlier

¹ Appeal Ref: A/C5690/W/16/3147702.

scheme and that proposed here. Whilst I accept that there are differences the proposal would still alter and enlarge the dwelling quite significantly. Given that this is one half of a pair of semi-detached houses the extensions and alterations would be such that the symmetry between the pair would be lost. Furthermore, I find that the proposed extensions and alterations would detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling itself. Whilst the rear elevation would not be evident in the street scene, the proposal overall would be. The altered shape and enlargement of the house would be particularly noticeable from the east where the proposal would be incongruous and harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

5. I note that No 174 has been extended and altered but this does not justify allowing a scheme which overall detracts from the character and appearance of the house itself, the pair of semi-detached houses and the wider area.
6. Core Strategy Policy 15² and DM Policy 30³ seek to achieve a high quality of design for all development. DM Policy 31 specifically refers to alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions. The Council's SPD⁴ provides detailed advice on the standards expected for residential development. I consider that the impact of the proposed extensions and alterations would not meet the standards expected by these policies and SPD. I conclude on this issue that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area in conflict with these policies.

Living Conditions

7. DM Policy 31 indicates that residential extensions should not result in a significant loss of privacy and amenity to adjoining houses and their back gardens. The rear extension would project a considerable distance close to the boundary with No 168 and although it would not affect privacy, it would appear overbearing. Likewise, from the side windows of No 172, the bulk and massing of the proposal would have an impact on the occupiers of this dwelling in terms of the overbearing effect of the east elevation.

Conclusion

8. I have considered all matters raised including the previous appeal decision and the matters raised there. However, I find this scheme unacceptable in terms of the harm it would cause to No 170 itself, the pair of semi-detached houses and the wider character and appearance of the area. The overall height, mass and scale of the proposal would also have a negative impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 168 and to a lesser degree to the occupiers of No 172.
9. The proposal would conflict with Core Strategy Policy 15, DM policies 30 and 31 and the Council's SPD. The appeal therefore fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

² Lewisham local development framework Core Strategy Development plan document, Adopted June 2011.

³ Lewisham local development framework Development Management Local Plan, Adopted 26 November 2014.

⁴ Lewisham Residential standards Supplementary planning document local development framework, Adopted August 2006, Updated notes included, May 2012 (SPD).