
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/20/3250231

115 Verdant Lane, London SE6 1JE

- 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 Gurmail Sehdev against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/19/114271, dated 14 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension, first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. A two-storey side extension is currently under construction at the site. Also, the Council's comments regarding discrepancies between the two-storey extension shown on the plans and a first-floor extension previously granted planning permission, are noted. However, as the appeal proposal before me relates solely to a first-floor rear extension shown on the submitted plans, this will be the focus of the following assessment.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 113 Verdant Lane in relation to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling within a dense residential location. As well as the two-storey side extension, construction of a single storey extension and a box dormer to the rear is also currently under

way. The proposal would introduce an L-shaped first-floor extension above the single storey rear extension currently under construction.

6. As the proposal would be located to the rear of the property, it would not be visible from the public realm nor would it impact upon the end of terrace nature of the dwelling. However, the proposed first floor extension would add to the already extensive built form to the rear of the dwelling, cumulatively resulting in a bulky and over-developed appearance to the rear. The flat roof and staggered nature of the extension, which is not typical in design, would appear at odds with the rest of the dwelling resulting in a disjointed addition to the property, that would appear incongruous within its surroundings.
7. It is noted that the materials proposed for the extension would match the existing dwelling and that the proposal would not affect a heritage asset. However, this would not overcome the harm found to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area due to the poorly integrated addition proposed. Although it is not overly large and would not exceed the height of the main dwelling, due to its awkward design and placement, it would not be a high-quality addition to the original dwelling.
8. For the reasons above I consider that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and therefore would be contrary to the relevant sections of Policy 15 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) and Policies 30 and 31 of the Development Management Local Plan (2014). These policies collectively require new development to attain a high standard of design with alterations and extensions to existing buildings respecting and/or complementing the form, setting, architectural characteristics, and detailing of the original building.
9. It would also be contrary to the general design principles within the Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD) which require extensions to be of a high-quality design.

Living Conditions

10. The proposed extension has been set back approximately 1 metre from the boundary with the neighbouring property, 113 Verdant Lane. The design of the proposal has been staggered to further reduce the impact on this neighbouring property. Due to these design features, the proposal would have limited visibility from the dwelling and garden at No.113 and would not have an overbearing impact upon its occupiers that would be significantly worse than at present.
11. Furthermore, due to the relatively modest height and depth of the proposed extension, and the distance from the boundary with this neighbouring property, the proposal would not detrimentally impact upon the daylight received to the rear windows or garden at No.113. Consequently, the proposal would not exacerbate problems of overshadowing, loss of light and a general sense of enclosure to the neighbouring property as highlighted within the SPD.
12. Overall, the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling, 113 Verdant Lane, and so in this regard would not conflict with the relevant sections of Policies 30 and 31 which seek to ensure that new development does not result in significant loss of amenity

(including sunlight and daylight) to adjoining houses and their back gardens and that any adverse impact on neighbouring amenity is addressed.

Conclusions and Recommendation

13. Although it has been found that the proposed development would not result in harm to the outlook of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, this would not outweigh the harm found to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR