
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/20/3248738
75 Alloa Road, London SE8 5AH

- 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 Raniero Russo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/19/114454, dated 29 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as the demolition of existing garage and removal of gate, and erection of two storey ancillary residential building with associated bin store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposals on: (a) the character and appearance of 73 Alloa Road and its surroundings, and (b) the living conditions of neighbouring residents in Trundley's Road with particular reference to visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. This part of Alloa Road is comprised of attractive terraces, of London stock brickwork, with ground floor bays and matching detailed features above windows and entrance doors. The appeal property is set well behind the frontage of the road on an irregularly shaped plot between 73 Alloa Road, which is an end-of terrace dwelling, and the rear boundaries of dwellings in Trundley's Road.
4. The appeal proposal, described in the application form as a two-storey ancillary residential building, would be set forward of the appeal property alongside 73 Alloa Terrace's side elevation. It would replace a single storey garage, which acts as the main entrance to the house behind. Although the appellant takes issue with the Council for treating the proposal as an extension to No 73, in my view, it would be perceived as such from outside the site, irrespective of its proposed ancillary linkage to No 75.
5. The scale and mass of the proposal is such that it would appear as a subservient addition to No 73. It would be slightly set back from No 73's front

elevation, so that the extension would not be seen from most points along Alloa Road from the north-east. Indeed, such is the tightly-knit nature of local development that the proposal, if built, would largely be screened by extant development and therefore seen from a very limited number of vantage points in the public realm, all close to the site.

6. A contemporary design is proposed. The development would serve as a proportionately sized visually contrasting element, and, although a matter of personal judgment, in my view the approach adopted is not objectionable.
7. The development would lead to the partial closure of the gap at first floor level currently in evidence between No 73 and the rear of the Trundley's Road properties. However, when viewed from Alloa Road, sufficient of the gap would remain above the garage at the rear of 117 Trundley's Road so as to achieve adequate visual separation.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of 73 Alloa Road or the terrace as a whole. Accordingly, no conflict arises with the general thrust of policies 7.4 & 7.6 of the London Plan (LP), Policy 15 of Lewisham's Core Strategy (CS) or Policies 30 & 31 of the Council's Development Management Local Plan (DMLP) which seeks to ensure that new development is well designed and sits acceptably in its context.

Living conditions

9. As already stated, local development is tightly knit, and the low degree of separation between the Trundley's Road properties and the appeal site is reflective of the era in which the properties were built.
10. I saw that the building would be built either on or very close to the boundary wall separating the appeal site from 119 Trundley's Road and close to the side boundary of No 121's rear garden. Both of these properties have small rear gardens, which to my mind would be dominated by the proposal, if built. The respective gardens would be increasingly, and unacceptably hemmed-in by the proposal, and the occupants of the properties would be subjected to an oppressive sense of enclosure when using it. I consider this to be a most un-neighbourly form of development.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupants of 119 & 121 Trundley's Road by reason of its unacceptable and harmful visual impact upon them. Accordingly, a clear conflict arises with those provisions of LP policy 7.6, CS policy 15 and DMLP policy 31 which seek to ensure that new development should not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers.

Other matters

12. The content of the submitted Sunlight and Daylight study is acknowledged and I note that the Council did not raise objections on this score.
13. Any planning related objections raised by a local resident have already been dealt with, but some of the matters raised are not planning related matters and are not therefore material to my considerations. I note the appellant's point that no resident in Trundley's Road objected, but whilst this is of some significance, it is not conclusive in my considerations.

14. All other matters raised in the representations have been taken into account, but none raised is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my overall conclusions set out below.

Planning balance and overall conclusions

15. On the first main issue identified at the outset, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of 73 Alloa Road or its surroundings.
16. However, on the second main issue, I find that the proposal would harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents. On balance, this is sufficient reason to dismiss the appeal.
17. Accordingly, for the reasons provided above, the appeal is dismissed.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR