



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2021

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/21/3269694

98 Chudleigh Road, London SE4 1HH

- 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 Shakeel Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/20/118300, dated 6 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is construction of a two storey extension at the side, together with the hip-to-gable and roof extension in the rear roof slope and 2 rooflights in the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Revised versions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the London Plan have been published since the appeal was lodged. The Council has confirmed which policies of the new London Plan it considers to be relevant to the proposal. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for this appeal.
3. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by an amended version on the decision notice and in subsequent appeal documents. I consider that subsequent description to accurately represent the proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the streetscape.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a semi-detached 2-storey dwelling with a hipped roof. It was previously one of a pair of semi-detached properties, although a terrace of three dwellings has been created through the extension of a neighbouring property. The appeal site has a ground floor offshoot which adjoins the single-storey garage of the neighbouring property of 96 Chudleigh Road.

6. The Council refers to the effect of the proposed side extension on the openness, character and appearance of the streetscape. However, a significant number of the nearby dwellings have 2-storey side extensions which gives the streetscape a more enclosed character and which has disrupted the rhythm of the regular arrangement of semi-detached properties. Although the gap between the side elevations of the appeal site and No 96 allows a view of the sky between the buildings, the evidence provided in respect of the Council's SPD¹ indicates that it only advises a limited set-back from the side boundary. On the basis of the evidence before me and my observations on site, the appeal proposal would not have a materially greater effect on openness than a similar proposal with set-back from the side boundary as referred to by the SPD.
7. However, the majority of the group of dwellings in the extent of the streetscape containing the appeal site have retained their hipped roofs. The appeal proposal would include a gable roof which would be a jarring addition within this roofscape, particularly due to the projection of this roof form towards the hipped roof of No 96.
8. The side extension would also project to the ridge of the roof of the host dwelling and would be flush with the front elevation. DM Policy 31 of the Council's Local Plan² specifies that side extensions should normally be set back and down from the main building line to allow for a clear break between existing buildings and the new work in order to maintain architectural subordination to the original building. The proposed extension would not comply with this, as due to its height and lack of set-back from the front elevation it would not be subordinate to the original building.
9. The buildings on this side of the road are in a stepped arrangement within the streetscape. But rather than creating a visual break in the façade, this layout would bring the proposed extension forward of the neighbouring property thereby increasing its prominence. Within this context, the provisions of DM Policy 31 in respect of the main building line are necessary in the interests of character and appearance.
10. The appellant refers to a number of other extensions in the area which are not set back from the front elevation. However, I have not been provided with the circumstances of those cases or the policies and advice in place at the time of their consideration. In any event, the examples I saw served to confirm the harm in respect of character and appearance that can arise from extensions of an inappropriate design.
11. The Council do not object to the principle of the rear dormer, other than it relies on the side and hip-to-gable extensions for its construction. I have no reason to disagree.
12. I conclude that, due to its lack of set back from the main elevation at first floor level, ridge height and gable roof design, the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the streetscape. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan, policy 15 of the Council's Core Strategy 2011 and policies 30 and 31 of the Local Plan which together seek to promote high quality design appropriate

¹ Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2019

² Development Management Local Plan 2014

for its context. The proposal would also be contrary to the Framework in respect of achieving well-designed places. The proposal would also not comply with the advice of the SPD in respect of the set back from the front façade and the set down from the main ridge line.

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR