



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2022 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/21/3287877

47 Ridgewell Close, London, SE26 5AP

- 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 Frederik Raynaud against the decision of the London Borough of Lewisham Council.
 - The application Ref DC/21/122851, dated 27 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and rear extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension and loft conversion at 47 Ridgewell Close, London, SE26 5AP, in accordance with the terms of application Ref DC/21/122851, dated 27 July 2021 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Drawing Nos. B.EX.0.1, B.EX.0.2, B.EX.2.1, B.EX.2.2, B.EX.2.3, B.EX.2.4, B.EX.3.1, B.EX.3.2, B.EX.3.3, B.EX.3.4, B.EX.4.1, B.EX.4.2, D.PR.0.1, D.PR.2.1, D.PR.2.2, D.PR.2.3, D.PR.2.4, D.PR.3.1, D.PR.3.2, D.PR.3.3, D.PR.3.4, D.PR.4.1, D.PR.4.2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed 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 comprises a two-storey end of terrace dwelling located within an established residential area characterised by small blocks of staggered terraced dwellings of varying sizes. Furthermore, to the south of the appeal site lies a three-storey block of flats. The adjoining property to the north at no. 48 projects beyond the appeal dwelling's rear elevation by a few metres due to the staggered nature of the terrace.
5. Whilst the total width of the L-shaped rear and side extension would be considerable, it would be stepped in at the common boundary with no.48 and would only project beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring property by approximately 2 metres. The single storey height of the extension would be modest, and its proposed rear depth would not unreasonably unbalance the scale of the existing house. Consequently, I do not find that the proposed extension would be excessively large or unacceptably dominate the host dwelling. It would be adequately proportioned, appear sufficiently subservient, and would retain an acceptable amount of garden space.
6. The side and rear extension would in part feature side pitched roofs as well as full pitched elements. The pitched roofs would be shallow and would harmonise well with the form and appearance of the existing roof. Furthermore, the extension would feature sympathetic materials that would match the appearance of the existing property.
7. The L-shaped extension would extend up to the pavement along the southern boundary, replacing the existing porch and brick wall. The Council states that this would be contrary to the advice set out in Lewisham Council's 'Alterations and Extensions' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which recommends that a side path of at least 1m is maintained to provide access to the rear garden. This guidance is not wholly applicable in this case as there is currently no side access to the garden or pathway along the southern boundary. The garden is accessed from the rear, via a gate within the western boundary, adjacent to the parking space. Also, there is already a solid built presence on the southern boundary given the existing porch and boundary wall. Given the above and in light of its modest height and simple design, the proposed side extension would not appear obtrusive or adversely impact the streetscene.
8. I note there are no other dormers in the direct vicinity of the site, and I acknowledge the proposed side dormer would feature prominently within the streetscene due to the corner plot location. However, the proposed dormer would feature a pitched roof, would be set down from the ridge line, set-in from the roof edges and set above the eaves in accordance with the guidance contained within the SPD. It would appear subordinate to the roof and would match the existing roof profile. In light of this, the dormer would respect the form and character of the property and would thus not appear as an incongruous addition. I do not find that it would visually erode the terrace of which the dwelling forms part, nor would it adversely impact the character of Ridgewell Close.
9. The proposal would therefore not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. In light of this, the development would not conflict with Policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy (2011), Policies 30 and 31 of the Development Management Local Plan (2014), and the guidance contained within the 'Alterations and Extensions' SPD which together seek to

ensure developments are well-designed, proportional and respectful of their surrounding contexts.

Other Matters

10. I have acknowledged the neighbour's concerns regarding the proposal. I consider, however, that the separation distance between the proposed rear extension and the neighbour's garden patio would be sufficient to prevent a loss of privacy and an adverse sense of enclosure. Given the separation distance and the single storey height of the extension, the living conditions of the neighbouring occupants at no. 48 would not be unreasonably impacted with regards to noise or a loss of light. On this matter, I therefore concur with the Council who considered the proposal would be acceptable and policy compliant in terms of its amenity impacts.
11. Furthermore, the drainage issue is not a matter within my remit and has therefore not had a bearing on my decision.

Conditions

12. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty.
13. I have also included the Council's suggested condition requiring the external materials match the existing building, in order to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Recommendation

14. The development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal would adhere to the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
15. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Caroline Mulloy

INSPECTOR