



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2019

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/19/3232352

21 Carholme Road, London SE23 2HT

- 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 Peter Dennis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/19/111115, dated 14 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is construction of a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the area; and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal dwelling and 19 Carholme Road.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a large, two-storey Victorian semi-detached dwelling located in a residential suburban area. Double height bay windows, generous window proportions and brick and stone detailing are characteristic of properties along the road, although there is variety in the house types here. There is a long return to the appeal dwelling, mirrored at both 19 Carholme Road and the attached neighbours at 23 Carholme Road. The appeal dwelling has a small single storey element attached to the return side elevation that is accessed from an internal door with a small external courtyard area located behind.
4. This element would be demolished and replaced by a two-storey flat roofed extension of a greater footprint than the existing building. The building line would extend flush with the rear wall of the host dwelling and align with the side elevation of the main house. The majority of the external courtyard area would be retained.

5. The extension would replace a much smaller subservient building with a much greater mass of development, extending two storeys in height and terminating above the eaves of the side return. The Council's Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD) specifically states that infill development should be no more than single storey in height.
6. The SPD also advocates new extensions to appear subordinate to the host dwelling. However, the extension at the height, scale and massing proposed would appear dominant in relation to the main house, rather than being subordinate to it.
7. Furthermore, its flat roof design, small windows and lack of architectural detailing would not reflect the design of the appeal property, which retains significant character. The proposal would therefore detract from the architectural qualities of the host dwelling, contrary to the advice contained within the SPD, that encourages high quality design and consideration of proportions, scale, height and how well the extension sits in relation to the host building.
8. Overall, due to the unsympathetic design characteristics, its positioning, scale and massing, the appeal proposal would create a form of development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal is contrary to the overarching principles of good design laid out in the Council's SPD and Policy 15 of the Core Strategy (the Core Strategy) (June 2011) and DM Policies 30 and 31 of the Lewisham local development framework Development Management Local Plan (DMLP) (November 2014), that also, amongst other criteria, requires new development to achieve good design.

Living Conditions

10. Turning to the matter of the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of the appeal site, the positioning of the extension would be directly in front of two windows of the host property that are labelled on the existing layout plans as both ground floor and first floor bedrooms. Although the proposed floor plans identify no room names, I see no reason to preclude these rooms from retaining their function as habitable rooms.
11. Only one window serves each of these rear facing rooms with acceptable outlook conditions to the back garden. As the SPD confirms, the returns of houses were not full width to allow windows and doors to be inserted to the side and rear elevations. Due to the close relationship of the proposed extension to these windows, the outlook would be obstructed by a façade that is closer in relationship than the existing element, significantly higher, and overall greater in scale and massing than the present situation. This would have an over-bearing and enclosing effect on outlook from these windows.
12. The dwelling of No. 19 is the same house type as the appeal property and the side return and small single storey element mirror one another. A ground floor with first-floor window directly above currently have an outlook over the single storey element towards the rear garden. At the height, scale, massing and projection proposed, the outlook from these windows would become enclosed and a tunnelling effect created. This would significantly harm the living conditions of the occupants to an unacceptable level.

13. For the foregoing reasons, I conclude that the appeal proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal dwelling and No. 19. This would be contrary to the design and amenity protection aims of the SPD and Policies 30 and 31 of the Council's DMLP, as well as Policy 15 of the Core Strategy.

Conclusion

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

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR