
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022

by Stephen Wilkinson BA BPI DIP LA MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/21/3288534
214 Whitefoot Lane, Bromley, BR1 5SQ

- 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 Mawila against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/21/121844, dated 17 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is construction of a single storey outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application was submitted for retrospective planning permission. Whilst the officer's delegated report indicates that the submitted plans do not reflect what has been built, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans before me. It was not possible to verify whether they accord with what has been built.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a 2 storey residential terraced property with a modest sized rear garden. The appeal scheme, located in the rear garden, is an outbuilding almost as wide as the garden, apart from a narrow pedestrian access leading to a rear gate by the boundary with No. 216 Whitefoot Lane.
5. The outbuilding has a depth of around 7metres, width of 6metres and height of 2.5metres. It is completed in white render.
6. Policies DM30 and DM31 of the Development Management Local Plan seek to ensure that extensions and alterations should be of a sensitive design and quality. These policies accord with the National Planning Policy Framework.
7. The appellant has referred to a number of other policies including CS15, DM32 and DM33 of the Development Plan and Policy D3 of the London Plan in evidence. Each of these includes a common thread that new development should adhere to the highest standards of design which should reflect the best characteristics of their locality.

8. Although rear outbuildings are commonly found throughout the area as demonstrated by the aerial photographs included in the appendices to the appellant's statement, it is unclear the planning history of each of these sites. However, from Figure 1 included in his statement the outbuilding is significantly larger than buildings in the immediate locality.
9. The appellant has referred to the fact that only limited alterations were made to the double garage to form the existing building. However, the new building represents extensive re modelling of the previous one, resulting in a significant increase in size. This dominates its immediate surroundings and is an intrusive feature in the immediate area.
10. The appellant has cited the decision of the Council to grant planning permission for a single storey outbuilding at No24 Whitefoot Lane which has a slightly larger footprint than the appeal scheme as a form of precedent. However, it is unclear the detailed planning history of the site to allow me to fully understand the Council's decision.
11. The appellant suggests that a building of similar size could be built as permitted development. However, I understand that as built, the scheme falls outside the limits of permitted development resulting in a large discordant outbuilding.
12. Finally, I conclude that the overall size of the outbuilding is excessive for the character and appearance of the locality and conflicts with policies D30 and D31 of the Development Management Local Plan.
13. Accordingly, I dismiss this appeal.

Stephen Wilkinson

INSPECTOR