
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2020

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/19/3243361

3 Sambruck Mews, Catford, London SE6 2NJ

- 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 Tyler against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/19/112866, dated 27 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is the Construction of single storey extension to front elevation, the replacement of windows: current double glazed timber casement to be replaced with uPVC double glazed units of similar format and the removal of the roof and the construction of first floor and roof matching existing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr and Mrs Tyler against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The description of the proposal on the decision notice varies from that on the planning application form. I have used that from the application form as it satisfactorily describes the development proposed.
4. The Council have raised no concerns relating to the single storey front extension and the replacement of the windows and I have no reason to disagree.

Main Issue

5. The main issue therefore is the effect of the first-floor extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the Sambruck Mews development.

Reasons

6. The appeal site forms one of a small number of detached bungalows which have been developed cohesively and which are of similar design, scale and materials, forming a mews style development accessed from Inchmery Road.

The main area of disagreement relates to the provision of a first-floor extension.

7. The site falls within the Culverley Green Conservation Area (the conservation area). Taking into account the character appraisal¹ the defining feature of the character and appearance of the conservation area sits largely in the strong cohesive identity of Edwardian residential development which comprises of dwellings fronting towards the highway in regimented formations along the streets with well sized rear gardens.
8. Sambruck Mews is a discreet and modern development, somewhat out of step with the character of the wider conservation area. It does however have limited visibility from public vantage points and therefore has a neutral impact.
9. The additional storey would be constructed above the majority of the footprint of the existing dwelling and would provide bedroom and bathroom accommodation. The extension has been carefully designed to match the property, would incorporate a set-back, a shallow hipped roof and would have no significant adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. I also appreciate that there is somewhat limited scope for increasing the footprint of the dwelling due to the compact nature of the development.
10. However, the extension would add significant bulk and mass to the dwelling. Given the other properties on Sambruck Mews are bungalows, the proposal would fail to respect the parameters of the existing development and its resultant appearance would be markedly different from others on the development. The design also proposes a blank elevation to the front elevation at first floor level which would lend the property an unwelcoming appearance.
11. The extension would therefore form an incongruous feature. Although the development is gated and its visibility is limited from the public domain and acknowledging that the property is set within the corner of the site, the proposal would be clearly visible from within the development itself.
12. The appeal proposal would therefore fail to accord with Policy 15 of the Lewisham Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) and Policies 30 and 31 of the Lewisham Local Development Framework Development Management Local Plan (2014) which amongst other things require high quality design and advise that extensions will not be permitted where they would adversely affect the form of the building or the architectural integrity of a group of buildings. The proposal would also fail to accord with the SPD² which generally discourages additional storeys other than those of lightweight form or exceptional architectural merit, neither of which would be the case with this proposal. While it does state that the provision of an extra storey could be acceptable on detached dwellings, it clearly advises that the surrounding context needs to be carefully considered.

Other Matters

13. I appreciate that the proposal would provide for much desired additional living space. Whilst I have afforded this matter weight, it does not outweigh the clear harm that I have identified above. Although concern has been raised in relation

¹ Lewisham Culverley Green conservation area character appraisal (2006).

² Lewisham local plan Alterations and Extensions Supplementary planning document (2019).

to correspondence with the council, limited information has been supplied and I can only therefore afford this matter limited weight.

Conclusion

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

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR