



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022 by Max Webb BA (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/21/3286188

32 Winn Road, London SE12 9EX

- 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 Nick Rumney against the decision of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/21/123319, dated 27 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and first floor rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and first floor rear dormer at 32 Winn Road, London SE12 9EX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/21/123319, dated 27 August 2021, 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 following approved plans: 978/01 and 978/03.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located in a residential area with a variety of properties, some of which have large side dormer extensions. The appeal property itself is similar in appearance to one neighbouring dwelling and has an existing rear pitched roof dormer.
5. The proposal would result in a box dormer to the rear roof slope, replacing the existing dormer. The dormer would be well set down from the ridge and sufficiently set in from the sides, and the overall size would therefore not appear dominant over the host dwelling. The proposed dormer would thus not harm the appearance of the original building or surrounding area.

6. Although the dormer would not conform with guidance in the SPD¹ with regards to the set up from the eaves, this would only be by a small amount. The additional size over the SPD recommendation would not result in the proposed dormer appearing disproportionate to the host dwelling. Furthermore, the SPD also suggests that rear dormers should relate sensitively to the host building and be well spaced and positioned on the roof slope. In this regard, the proposed dormer would conform. In any case, the SPD provides advice and guidance rather than determinative policy.
7. Due to the presence of visible dormers and the range of property types in the area, the proposed dormer would not appear incongruous or harm the appearance of the surrounding area.
8. The proposal also includes a single storey rear extension, and the Council have raised no concerns over this. The size, design and materials used for this extension would ensure that it would appear subordinate to the host dwelling. I therefore find no reason to disagree with the Council.
9. Overall, the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policy 15 of the Core Strategy², which aims to ensure development is sensitive to the local context. Likewise, it would conform with Policies 30 and 31 of the Local Plan³, which together require development to preserve the urban form and for alterations and extensions to respect the form of original buildings. It would also accord with Policies BE1 and BE2 of the NDP⁴ which together look to prevent alterations or extensions that impact on the character and appearance of the townscape and require development to have regard to the scale and massing of buildings and streets. Similarly, it would comply with Policy D3 of the London Plan (adopted 2021) which aims to deliver buildings that respond positively to local distinctiveness and character. It would also conform with Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (adopted 2021), which looks to create high quality and well-designed buildings and places.
10. The Council have also referred to Policy D1 of the London Plan, however this is primarily strategic in nature and is therefore not greatly relevant to this householder development.

Other Matters

11. Whilst disruption may occur due to works related to the proposal, these would not have a significant impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, even with health issues taken into account. In any event, extending and altering a dwelling may not require permission and would not necessarily be less disruptive than this proposal.

Conditions

12. I have recommended the standard time condition for reasons of certainty. For the same reason, I have also suggested conditions regarding plans and materials, as well as to ensure an appropriate level of design that protects the character and appearance of the dwelling.

¹ Lewisham Local Plan Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2019)

² Lewisham Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted 2011)

³ Lewisham Local Development Framework Development Management Local Plan (adopted 2014)

⁴ Grove Park Neighbourhood Development Plan 2018-2033 (adopted 2019)

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the Development Plan as a whole, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR