



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2017

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

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

Decision date: 20 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/17/3180628
77 Canonbie Road, London, SE23 3AQ.

- 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 Greg Lascelles against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/17/101333, dated 26 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension to accommodate a bedroom and shower room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension to accommodate a bedroom and shower room at 77 Canonbie Road, London, SE23 3AQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/17/101333, dated 26 April 2017, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: CRA 1602-P00, P01, P02, P10 revision B, P12 revision B and SK 10.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair of houses and thereby the street scene.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, 77 Canonbie Road, is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling house. Due to the topography of the area, the other half of this semi-detached pair, number 75, is set much lower than number 77. Similarly number 79, its neighbour to the south-east, is set much higher.
4. Along with earlier rear and side extensions, number 77 also features a large rear-facing dormer. The existing single storey side extension has served to decrease the gap to number 79 at ground floor level. The walls of the dwelling are finished in white painted render with the main roof being slate covered.

5. The area is characterised by a mix of mainly similar two-storey detached and semi-detached properties, along with some larger and more contemporary residential developments.
6. The appellant proposes the construction of a first floor side extension along with alterations to the side and rear elevations. The Council raises no objection to the alterations to the side and rear elevations, which comprise minor changes to the fenestration. From what I have seen and read I would not form a contrary view. While my determination will be made on the entire proposal I shall therefore confine my considerations to the proposed side extension.
7. The extension would be built over an existing single storey addition. The ridgeline of the extension would be set well below that of the main roof as well as below the eaves line of the neighbouring property number 79. The front and rear walls would be set comfortably in from both the front and rear walls of the original dwelling house. That to the front would also be located to the rear of the front wall of the existing single storey side extension. The side wall of the proposed extension would be set in from the line of the side wall of the existing ground floor addition and a shadow gap formed between the neighbouring properties. While the visual gap so formed would be relatively small, there would nevertheless appear to be one if the extension were built as designed.
8. In addition, the front wall would slope, having the profile of a traditional mansard roof. Furthermore, the front and rear walls along with the roof of the extension would be clad in slate. This would not only match the roof of the dwelling but also contrast with its white painted walls.
9. In my judgement, as a result of the proposed design and choice of materials, the proposed extension would appear as a subservient contrasting addition in the context of the host property and the semi-detached pair.
10. I appreciate, from my observations on site, that the proposed first floor side extension would, from some angles, reduce the apparent visual gap between numbers 77 and 79. However, due in part to the topography of the site, the existing relationship between the properties, the limited height of the extension, the fact that it would be set in from the main facades, its three dimensional form (in particular the sloping front wall), the proposed adoption of a contrasting cladding material and the formation of the shadow gap, I consider, on balance, that it would not serve to visually link the neighbouring properties such that they would appear as a terrace of three.
11. Accordingly, I am not persuaded, as suggested by the Council, that the proposed extension would appear incongruous, uncharacteristic or so alien in this context as to have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair of houses or the street scene.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair of houses or thereby the street scene. The development would therefore accord with Policy 15 of the Lewisham Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted June 2011), DM Policies 30 and 31 of the Lewisham Local Development Framework Development Management Local Plan (Adopted November 2014) and Section 6 of the Lewisham Local Development Framework Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted August

2006 and updated notes included May 2012) as they relate to the quality of development, its effect on the architectural integrity of a group of buildings as a whole or the street scene.

Conditions

13. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. Notwithstanding the Council's suggestion, I see no need to attach a condition in respect of building materials as these are clearly shown on the appellant's drawings reference CRA1602-P11 Revision B.
14. In the interests of certainty, I shall however impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal is in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole, and that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR