
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 September 2017

by J Ayres BA Hons, Solicitor

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

Decision date: 19th September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/17/3180750
5 Kingshurst Road, London SE12 9LD

- 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 and Mrs Barton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/17/100543, dated 7 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a part single/part two storey side/rear extension, rear dormer window, 2 velux roof windows to front roof and porch alterations.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The character of the area is distinguished by small rows of terraced houses alongside pairs of semi-detached houses. This grain of development provides a pleasant break in the built form. A number of properties benefit from generous rear gardens, the front gardens are more modest. Accordingly, when viewing the properties from the front, the breaks in the dwellings contribute to the sense of space and openness.
4. The extent of the extension to the side, particularly at first floor level, would be a significant increase in the mass and scale of the host dwelling. It would substantially decrease the gap between the host dwelling and the adjacent property at No 3 Kingshurst Road. This would intensify the level of built form at this point, and in my view would have a detrimental impact on the open character that the first floor gaps provide.
5. The side extension would be within the suggested measurements set out in the Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (Updated 2012) with regards to the roof line and building line. However, the SPD specifically provides that the depth of an extension may vary considerably, dependant on the nature of the urban form of the street and the character and rhythm of the street. The dimensions of the extension would not acknowledge the rhythm of the street, where gaps are maintained to break up development. Although a

small gap would be left between the dwelling and the boundary, this would be minimal and in my view would have a limited impact in terms of preserving the sense of space. In this instance I consider that the proposal would be an incongruous addition to the dwelling, appearing cramped between the host dwelling and No 3, and breaking the sense of rhythm present in this row of properties.

6. The appellant has referred me to No 26 Kingshurst Road, which had a similar extension approved by the Council. I noted on my site visit that the effect of that extension, along with works to the neighbouring property, had infilled one of the gaps which contributes to the pattern of development and provides a break in the built form. In my view it does not automatically follow that additional developments that would further harm the character and appearance of the area should be allowed. Each case must be considered independently and I have determined this appeal based on its own merits.
7. The rear element of the proposal would be set down from the main roof ridge of the host dwelling by approximately 1 metre, and the pitch would match that of the main roof. In my view, this element of the proposal would appear subservient to the main dwelling and it would sit more comfortably within the existing built form.
8. I consider the rear element of the proposal would be in keeping with the host dwelling and neighbouring properties. I also accept that the proposed materials would match that of the host dwelling. However, I find that the overall bulk and mass of the side extension would not appear subservient to the host dwelling and would be out of keeping with the built form at this point of the street. As a result it would appear as an incongruous development, causing harm to the character and coherence of the street scene. The acceptable elements of the proposal would not outweigh the harm that I have found in relation to the impact of the side extension.
9. Consequently, I find that the proposal would conflict with Policy 15 of the Core Strategy (June 2011) in respect of securing high quality design. The proposal would be contrary to Policies 30 and 31 of the Development Management Local Plan (2014) with regards to the design aims of those policies. The proposal would also conflict with the overall aim of the Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Ayres

INSPECTOR