

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2020

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/20/3258551

91 Chinbrook Road, Grove Park, London SE12 9QL

- 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 Shane Roach against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/20/116884, dated 24 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a 'ground floor side extension, first floor side extension, garage conversion and all associated works'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Amended plans (Rev. A) were submitted during the application process. The Council has explained that because the revised plans did not overcome the identified concerns, the application was determined on the basis of the plans originally submitted. However, the revised plans are referred to within the Council's Refusal Notice and they show only minor alterations to the scheme. I am satisfied that no injustice would be served if my assessment of the proposal is based on the amended plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its relationship with the attached dwelling, along with its effect on the character and appearance of the street scene within which it sits.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a semi-detached house which is located within a row of similar dwellings. The proposal includes a two storey extension, a single storey extension and a garage conversion. The Council raises no issue with the single storey extension and garage conversion and nor do I.
 5. The roof of the proposed extension would be set down from the ridge of the host dwelling and the extension itself would be set back from the principal
-

elevation. However, the roof of the proposed extension would finish in a gable, rather than a hip following the hip of the main roof. As a result, the proposed extension would appear as an overly bulky and jarring addition which would not follow the form of the host dwelling.

6. To my mind, some loss of symmetry is inevitable when introducing a two storey extension to one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings. However, the sound design advice contained within the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document titled '*Alterations and Extensions*' (SPD), which includes setting extensions back from the front elevation, down from the ridge and in from the side boundary, along with following the form of the host dwelling, is aimed at reducing this impact to an acceptable degree. Whilst the proposed two storey side extension would follow some of this guidance, a failure to follow the existing roof profile of the host dwelling would result in a structure which would noticeably imbalance this pair of semi-detached dwellings. The harmful effect would be visible from the public domain, where the extension would be seen as a discordant feature.

Other considerations

7. The Appellant refers to a number of two storey side extensions present within the immediate locality. I do not know the precise planning circumstances behind the examples highlighted, but none include a roof arrangement directly comparable to the proposal before me. I accept that these additions have caused some variety within the street scene and some do not contribute positively to it. However, they do not justify a proposal which would cause further harm.
8. The Appellant also refers to Certificates of Lawful Development relating to the appeal property which include a hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer (Ref. DC/19/113325) and a single storey rear extension (Ref. DC/20/117333). I have not been furnished with the associated plans but there is no suggestion that they are comparable to the scheme before me in terms of size and scale. Accordingly, I attach limited weight to them as a consideration.

Overall Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, would unduly imbalance its relationship with the attached dwelling and would appear incongruous within the street scene. In these respects, it conflicts with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, policy 15 of the adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy, policies 30 and 31 of the adopted Development Management Local Plan and the SPD, which all promote high quality design which responds well to its surroundings.
10. The arguments advanced by the Appellant in favour of the proposed development do not outweigh the identified harm and policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed. A split decision is not possible in this case because the acceptable elements of the scheme are not physically severable.

David Fitzsimon INSPECTOR