



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 February 2021

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 01 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/20/3255833 66 Codrington Hill, London, SE23 1ND

- 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 Graham Grimwood (Grimwood & Bowdery) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/19/113227, dated 22 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey infill extension to sit flush with the side elevation of the main building, a single storey rear extension (with eaves height of 3m) with folding doors in the rear elevation, a wrought iron balustrade around the roof terrace, and partial removal of the boundary fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey infill extension to sit flush with the side elevation of the main building, a single storey rear extension (with eaves height of 3m) with folding doors in the rear elevation, a wrought iron balustrade around the roof terrace, and partial removal of the boundary fence at 66 Codrington Hill, London, SE23 1ND in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/19/113227, dated 22 July 2019.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's and Appellant's paperwork all have varying, and in parts contradictory, descriptions of the development and I draw upon these and the submitted plans to accurately describe the works as above.
3. The development has been completed; this does not alter my approach to determining the merits of the proposal.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality and on living conditions for neighbours.
-

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site is within a mixed residential area and is a two-storey semi-detached property in 4 flats adjacent to Blythe Hill Fields Park. The rear and side of the property is open to views from this elevated public open space. The property has an original two storey projection similar to the adjoining semi-detached property. Recent works have been undertaken as described above.
6. Rather than previous fencing the infill side extension forms part of the side boundary to the Park and the Council is concerned that this is visually intrusive. However, with its brick finish to the side, surmounted by wrought iron roof terrace railing, I found it to be in scale with the host dwelling, sympathetic to its setting and a characteristic approach to a property lying alongside extensive public open space whilst giving a sound boundary definition thereto. It is not jarring on the eye and complements the form of the dwelling as it previously stood. The modest single storey rear extension is innocuous from the public realm given scale, siting and ground levels and is benign in terms of impacting of character on the host building. I did not find the use of render on part of the adjuncts to be unsympathetic or visually awkward and in any event appreciable areas of surfacing are glazing or brickwork.
7. The Council cites Policy 15 High Quality Design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) (CS), DM Policy 30 Urban Design and Local Character and DM Policy 31 Alterations and Extensions to Existing Buildings including Residential Extensions of the Development Management Local Plan (2014) (LP), and the Alterations and Extensions SPD (2019) (SPD). Taken together, and amongst other matters, these policies and guidance seek to protect the appearance and character of buildings and neighbourhoods. I conclude that the appeal proposal would not run contrary to these policies or the relevant objectives of the SPD.

Living conditions

8. An approved scheme for the rear extension (DC/17/101000) incorporated a roof which included sloped glazing at its most projecting part. The structure has been erected with a flat roof. The effect of this is to 'lift' the end part of the roof heading down the garden by some 400mm. The Council is concerned that this increase in massing would be excessive and overbearing for neighbouring residents. In my opinion the modest projection of the extension, and the overall height being around 3m, combined with available garden lengths and an orientation to the north east, would mean that there would not be undue impacts or indeed marked change in amenity terms between the approved scheme and that before me. I say this having visited the site and carefully considered the range of points put forward by one of the residents living in the neighbouring property.
9. CS Policy 15 along with LP Policies 30 and 31 taken together, and amongst other matters, also seek to protect residential amenity. I conclude that the appeal proposal would not run contrary to these policies. These policies share

similar objectives to the SPD in terms of protecting living conditions and I conclude there would be no breach to this guidance.

Other matters

10.I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered and the development plan policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Conditions

11.The Council makes no suggestions for conditions and given that the works are complete I see no need to impose any.

Overall conclusion

12.For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable effects on the character and appearance of the host property or the locality or on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR