



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2020

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/20/3255607
26 Tewkesbury Avenue, London SE23 3DQ

- 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 Ms Jo Sharp against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/20/115987, dated 3 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is complete refurbishment of existing house with new side extension, small infill rear extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the complete refurbishment of existing house with new side extension, small infill rear extension and loft conversion at 26 Tewkesbury Avenue, London SE23 3DQ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DC/20/115987, dated 3 March 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) Prior to the development hereby permitted commencing, a schedule, including specifications of all external materials including cladding, doors/windows and roof coverings to be used in the construction of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: Location Plan dated 21 February 2020; Drawing Numbers 2.03.01, 2.03.02, 2.03.03, 2.05.01, 2.05.02, 2.05.03 (existing plans and elevations) and 2.12.01B, 2.12.02B, 2.12.03B, 2.12.04B, 2.14.01B, 2.14.02B and 2.14.03B (proposed plans and elevations).
 - 4) The flat roofed areas arising from the development hereby approved, shall only be accessed for maintenance purposes and shall not be used as amenity space.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the appeal the appellant has provided the following revised drawings: 2.12.01B; 2.12.02B; 2.12.03B 2.12.04B; 2.14.01B; 2.14.02B and 2.14.03B ('Revised Drawing Pack'). These incorporate the following revisions and

amendments: a rectification of an error on Drawing No. 2.12.03 which showed part of the proposed loft conversion being built astride the shared boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property; the incorporation of sliding doors to the originally proposed bike and bin store to avoid any conflict with pedestrians using the adjacent pavement; information on trees and hedgerows to be retained; the inclusion of privacy screens to the proposed rear terrace and the incorporation of a 150mm set-back at ground floor for the proposed two-storey side extension. As these amendments and revisions address concerns raised by the Council and do not significantly alter the nature of the development originally proposed, I have accepted the Revised Drawing Pack as a substitute for the proposed drawings originally submitted with the application. I have also determined this appeal on the basis of this and do not consider that the interests of any party have been prejudiced by my having done so.

Application for costs

3. An application for costs was made by Ms Jo Sharp against the London Borough of Lewisham. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is architecturally similar to the adjoining semi-detached dwelling. The appeal property also benefits from generous space between it and the other neighbouring property to the north. This and other gaps between properties along this side of the road provide some openness and relief between the built forms.
6. Nevertheless, a number of nearby properties have been subject to extensions and alterations, including two-storey side extensions and roof alterations. Therefore, the scale of the properties along with the spacing between these is varied, as are their designs. Consequently, these alterations and extensions have resulted in a diverse streetscape and the degree of symmetry between corresponding pairs of semi-detached dwellings has also been largely eroded.
7. In considering the proposal, the Council has also referred to its adopted Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The SPD seeks to ensure that the highest design quality is achieved in residential extensions and alterations and provides guidance on this. Although examples of extensions to nearby properties pre-date the Council's SPD, these still contribute to the character and appearance of the area and form part of the setting for the proposal. Accordingly, I have applied the SPD as guidance while having regard to the appeal property and area.
8. The proposed hip-to-gable roof conversion would be consistent with other similar conversions within the street scene and the increase in mass and alteration to the overall form of the original roof would not be particularly discernible in views from the highway, given the varied street scene and the elevated position of the host property.
9. Although the proposed two-storey extension would be more than half the width of the original dwelling, it would incorporate a flat roof with a noticeably lower

height. In particular, the effect of the elongated side extension would be mitigated by its set-back from the host property at both ground and first floor levels. These design interventions along with the use of extensive glazing to the frontage of the side extension, including a feature window at first floor level, would limit its overall size and bulk, making it visibly subordinate to the host property when viewed from the highway.

10. Furthermore, due to its simple form, use of patinated zinc cladding and contrasting fenestration designs to those for the original dwelling, the two-storey extension would appear as a contemporary addition, while the use of painted render would provide a degree of continuity and assimilation with the existing dwelling.
11. The proposed side extension would be set-in from the shared boundary with the neighbouring property to the north and combined with its set-back and flat roof form would retain adequate space about the appeal property. This, along with the space to the side of the neighbouring property, would provide an appreciable degree of separation between these dwellings, which would be consistent with the prevailing pattern of development. Although the proposal would reduce the extent of symmetry associated with the adjoining semi-detached property, this would not be uncharacteristic for the area.
12. The Council has concluded that the proposed single storey rear extension is acceptable in terms of its height, siting and design, I have also considered this and have no reason to reach a different conclusion.
13. For the above reasons, the proposed development is well considered, and would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, I find no conflict with the design aims of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (March 2016) Policy 15 of the adopted Core Strategy (2011) and Policies 30 and 31 of the Development Management Local Plan (2014). Together, these policies seek to secure high quality developments which respond positively to local character.

Other matters

14. Due to the overall separation of the proposed extensions from properties to the rear of the appeal site and intervening boundary treatments, the proposed upper-level, rear facing window would not result in any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy.
15. The proposed rear terrace would be located on a similar level to the existing rear garden and would be adequately screened from neighbours by the existing boundary treatments. Consequently, although the proposed drawings include privacy screens to the side of the rear terrace, these are not necessary.

Conditions

16. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council in light of the requirements of the National Planning Practice Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard timescale condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved drawings as this provides certainty. A condition requiring details of the proposed external materials is necessary in the interests of the appearance of the development.

17. The level of information provided in respect of hard/soft landscaping and boundary treatments on the proposed drawings is proportionate to the scale of the proposal. Therefore, it is not necessary to require any further details by conditions.
18. To safeguard the privacy of neighbours, I have imposed a condition to restrict the use of flat roofed areas arising from the development from being used as amenity space. Condition 2 which prevents any development approved from commencing until this has been complied with, is considered fundamental to the development hereby approved. It is necessary for this to take the form of 'pre-commencement' condition in order to have its intended effect. Where necessary and in the interests of clarity and precision, I have altered the conditions to better reflect the relevant guidance.

Conclusion

19. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR