



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/20/3257820

60 Erlanger Road, London SE14 5TG

- 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 Mrs Jessica Ware against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
- The application Ref DC/20/115496, dated 29 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2020.
- The proposed development is demolition of existing rear addition, rear wrap around extension at ground floor level.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a single storey rear and side extension (wrap around), together with relocation of the existing timber gate at the side boundary wall at 60 Erlanger Road, London SE14 5TG, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/20/115496, dated 29 January 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 0105-ABA-00-005, 0105-ABA-00-006, 0105-ABA-00-010, 0105-ABA-00-011, 0105-ABA-00-020A, 0105-ABA-00-021A, 0105-ABA-00-022A, 0105-ABA-00-030A, 0105-ABA-00-060, 0105-ABA-00-100A, 0105-ABA-00-101A, 0105-ABA-00-200A, 0105-ABA-00-201A, 0105-ABA-00-202A, 0105-ABA-00-203, 0105-ABA-00-300A, 0105-ABA-20-500 and 0105-ABA-20-501.
 3. No development shall commence until details of the timber cladding to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall be maintained thereafter.
 4. Existing bricks shall be reclaimed and used to infill the gap resulting from the alterations in the side boundary brick wall.

Appeal Procedure

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

Procedural Matters

3. The name of the applicant on the application form is Ware. The name of the appellant on the appeal form is Ms J Ware. It has been confirmed in subsequent correspondence from the agent that the appellant is Mrs Jessica Ware, and that is the name I have used within the banner heading above.
4. The description of the proposed development as included on the decision notice makes reference to the repositioning of a gate in the side boundary wall, which is not explicitly referenced within the description included within the application form. I have therefore included this within my decision above as it provides a more comprehensive description of the proposal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area (THCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises a three-storey, end-of-terrace dwellinghouse situated on the corner of Sherwin Road and Erlanger Road. Like many properties within the surrounding area, the property features a three-storey rear outrigger as well as a lean-to rear extension at ground-floor level. The site lies within the THCA, whose significance is largely derived from its suburban character and the uniform and cohesive architecture of its Victorian dwellinghouses.
7. The depth of the proposed extension as measured from the end of the rear outrigger would be almost the same as that of the existing lean-to extension. Although the proposal would extend along a part of the side return, much of the side elevation of the outrigger would be left unaltered, such as the side-facing bay window. While aesthetically contemporary, resulting from the use of timber cladding and steel, the form, materiality and lightweight design of the proposal would be of a high quality and would be limited to a single storey. As such, it would contrast acceptably with the host dwelling without detracting from its overall character. Therefore, due to its limited height, depth and scale, as well as its high-quality design, the proposal would appear as a subservient addition that would respond positively to the proportions and character of the host building.
8. As the proposal would be set back behind the southern boundary wall, with its roof sloping towards the northern boundary with No. 58, it would not appear overtly prominent within public views from the junction. While it would appear relatively more prominent within views along Sherwin Road from the west, it would nonetheless appear as a subservient element within the streetscene when seen as part of the host building and the wider terrace due to its limited scale and lightweight materiality. Furthermore, during my site visit, I saw that many similar corner dwellings within the vicinity of the site and throughout the THCA had been subject to a variety of wraparound ground-floor rear extensions. The proposal would therefore integrate well with the established character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene as well as the broader THCA, whose significance would not be harmed.
9. I note comments made regarding the quality of the proposed timber cladding. As further details could be secured through condition to ensure that the

proposed cladding would be acceptable, and would be maintained after construction, I consider this aspect of the proposal to be acceptable. A condition can also be imposed to ensure the work to facilitate the relocation of the gate in the boundary wall involves the use of reclaimed bricks. This would ensure this alteration also has no harmful impact on the character and appearance of the THCA.

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the THCA, and so would cause no harm to its special interest as a designated heritage asset. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies DM30 and DM31 of the Development Management Local Plan 2014 (the DMLP) which, amongst other things, state that development should be of the highest standard of design and that extensions should respect and complement the form, setting and detailing of the original building. The proposal would also comply with Policy DM36 of the DMLP which, amongst other things, states that development should conserve the significance of heritage assets and their settings.

Other Matters

11. Due to the low scale of development proposed, I do not consider that the proposal would be likely to cause any harm to the structural stability of either the appeal property or No 58, nor would any demolition statement be necessary. Furthermore, from my site visit it is clear that the construction of the proposal would not result in the loss of any significant shrubbery, trees or other vegetation.
12. From the submitted drawings, I am satisfied that the proposed rainwater guttering pipes would ensure that rainwater would not flow from the roof of the proposal into the adjoining garden or conservatory of No 58.
13. Issues relating to party wall agreements are not relevant to planning.

Conditions

14. The conditions which are imposed are largely those which have been suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the scheme be built in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt. As the materials to be used are detailed within the approved drawings, I have not found it necessary to impose a separate condition relating to the materials of the proposal.
15. However, I have imposed a condition requiring that further details regarding the kind of timber cladding to be used must be submitted to and approved by the Council prior to the commencement of development. This condition is to ensure that high-quality cladding will be used as part of the approved extension and shall be maintained thereafter, in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the THCA. For the same reason, I have also attached a condition requiring that existing bricks shall be used to infill the resulting gap in the side boundary wall.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR