
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2020

by S Harley BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI ARICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/19/3242015

67 Allerford Road, London SE6 3DG

- 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 Mrs Dorcas Adesanya against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/19/113530, dated 15 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey side and rear extension.
-

Procedural Matters

1. Although the planning application form was completed to the effect that the agent (Inspired Plans) was the applicant, it is clear from the completed certificate that accompanied the application that the applicants were Mr and Mrs Adesanya, the owners. I have therefore dealt with the appeal as proceeding in the name of Mrs Dorcas Adesanya, as indicated on the appeal form.
2. I have used the description of development as stated by the Council on the decision notice as this more succinctly describes the proposed development.

Decision

3. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single storey side and rear extension at 67 Allerford Road, London SE6 3DG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/19/113530, dated 15 August 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property and the adjoining property, No 26 Watermead Road, are a pair of semi-detached houses in triangular shaped plots. Their front façades face the acute junction formed by Allerford Road and Watermead Road. The surrounding area predominantly comprises detached and semi-detached houses of mixed sizes and styles.

6. The proposed extension would be an 'L' shape wrapping around the side and rear of the host building. As the property is not in a conservation area such a form would not, in principle, conflict with the Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (the SPD). This provides guidance to ensure that alterations and extensions meet the high quality design standards sought by Policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy 2011 (the CS) and DM Policies 30 and 31 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan 2014 (the DMP).
7. The rear extension would be about 2.3m deep. The side extension would be about 3.1m wide, which would be about half the width of the frontage of the house, and it would be set back by about 150 mm from the front corner of the host building – itself set back from the prominent front gable feature. It would have a hipped roof facing the roads and the highest point would be below the first floor windows on both the side and rear elevations. Accordingly it would not have an unduly harmful effect on the architectural integrity of the host property.
8. Although the side extension would be relatively long, and would appear quite large when viewed from the road, it would be set at an angle and would be partially obscured by the brick wall that encloses the side/rear garden. Accordingly it would not have an unduly harmful effect on the wider street scene. In these respects I find the proposed extension would not overwhelm the host dwelling and would not conflict with the SPD.
9. The proposed extension at the point nearest No 26 would not extend more than half the depth of the original rear garden/yard. However, one corner of the proposed extension would adjoin the shared boundary with the neighbour at No 65 Allerford Road and another corner would adjoin the site boundary to Allerford Road. As shown on the plan, a path around the extension to the rear garden, as recommended in the SDP, would not be provided, although there would be access to both retained garden areas from the proposed lounges. As the site is triangular in shape, with the house at an angle to the adjoining roads, the proposed extension does not neatly match the examples provided in the SPD. The Council do not object to the effect on the available garden area and I see no reason to disagree. For these reasons I consider the proposal would not amount to overdevelopment of the site.
10. Although quite a large extension, for the reasons set out above, I consider the proposed extension would be sufficiently subordinate to the host property and would not overly dominate the original house footprint. On balance I conclude the effect on the on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene to be acceptable. Accordingly I conclude there would be no conflict with Policy 15 of the CS; DM Policies 30 and 31 of the DMP; or the guidance in the SPD.

Other Matters

11. Concerns have been raised about the demolition of the garage, with the resulting loss of its side wall that currently forms part of the boundary between Nos 67 and 65, and the potential for damage during construction. However, these are private matters that do not go to the heart of the planning considerations of the appeal proposal.

12. Concern has also been raised about disruption arising from works during unsocial hours, weekends or bank holidays. Some disruption is inevitable during construction. The Council has not proposed any restrictions on the hours in which works could take place and I am mindful that the lack of such restrictions may well result in the works being completed more quickly. Accordingly this matter does not lead me to any different conclusion.

Conditions

13. As well as the standard condition specifying the time limits for the commencement of development compliance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. The walls of the existing house have red bricks at ground floor level and roof tiles. The application form proposes red bricks and concrete tiles to match the existing ones and a condition requiring this is necessary in the interests of the appearance of the area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above the appeal is allowed.

S Harley

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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: A00 Rev P1; A01 Rev P1 – Existing Elevation; A01 Rev P1 – Site Plan; A02 Rev P1; A03 Rev P4; A05 Rev P02; and A06 Rev P02.
- 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the matching materials specified on the planning application form.

End of Schedule