



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2022

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/22/3307555

32 Trilby Road, Forest Hill, Lewisham, London SE23 2DN

- 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 Mrs Kate Bennett against the decision of London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/22/126727, dated 11 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is to demolish existing ground floor rear extension. New ground floor rear extension along with 1st floor rear extension and loft extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on 1) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and 2) the living conditions of the occupants of no. 30 Trilby Road with specific regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwellinghouse. It is located on a street of similar properties that has a gradual descent towards Cibber Road. Many of the surrounding properties have been extended or altered, particularly in the form of rear extensions.
4. The property has an existing rear dormer extension and a single storey ground floor rear extension. The adjoining property, no 30 Trilby Road, has an existing single storey rear extension. The adjacent terrace, comprising nos. 1-3 Thornhill Villas, has existing two storey outriggers and single storey rear extensions.
5. The proposed development includes a number of distinguishable features, namely a two-storey outrigger extension with dormer, a first-floor extension with flat roof and a single storey ground floor extension with flat roof. These are all located at the rear of the property, where the development would also involve the demolition of the existing single storey ground floor rear extension.
6. Although the properties that are similar to the appeal property do not contain rear outrigger extensions, I consider that the siting of the dwelling at the end

of the terrace, adjacent to the existing outrigger at no. 3 Thornhill Villas, creates a specific situation whereby a well-designed outrigger may not necessarily be inappropriate.

7. Although there are outrigger extensions and rear dormer windows close to the appeal property, the combination of the outrigger and the dormer above, due to its overall size and scale, creates a bulky and incongruous feature that dominates the property and its roofscape.
8. Furthermore, it does not relate well with the proposed flat roofed first floor extension, which when combined with the outrigger and its dormer creates a clumsy and somewhat awkward appearance, lacking in visual cohesion.
9. The single storey, flat roofed ground floor rear extension is not so impacted by the rather haphazard arrangement that is proposed across the first and second floors. This part of the development would appear as a neat and well-ordered addition to the property that does not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area.
10. I therefore find that whilst certain elements of the development do not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, namely the unadorned outrigger and the single storey ground floor extension; the introduction of the dormer to the outrigger and the flat-roofed first floor extension cause cumulative harm overall to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
11. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy (2011), Policies 30 and 31 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan (2014) and Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021). Collectively, these policies require that development, including extensions, are of a high quality and standard of design.
12. It would also be contrary to guidance contained within the Lewisham Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2019) which outlines that all extensions and alterations must not be excessive in scale, and that L shaped roof alterations should not overly dominate the original dwelling and should demonstrate exceptional architectural quality.
13. The development would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) requirement that developments are of high quality and visually attractive.

Living conditions

14. The proposed single storey rear extension would run along the boundary with the adjoining property, no. 30 Trilby Road. Like the appeal property, this adjoining property has an existing single storey rear extension to the ground floor. There is an existing high level boundary treatment between the two properties.
15. Although the proposed single storey extension would project further than the existing extension to the adjoining property, due to its overall size, scale and siting, the impact on the outlook from the adjoining property would not be unacceptable.

16. The proposed flat roof element of the first-floor extension would also project outwards along the boundary with no. 30. The closest window in the neighbouring property, however, serves a bathroom and the closest habitable room window at the first-floor level is a sufficient distance from the extension to ensure that the impact on outlook is not unacceptable.
17. The proposed outrigger and dormer would inevitably alter the existing outlook, however given its overall size, scale and siting, combined with the position of windows in the rear elevation of no. 30, the impact on outlook would not be unacceptable or overbearing.
18. The proposed development would therefore not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupants of no. 30 Trilby Road with regard to outlook. It would comply with Policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy (2011), Policies 30 and 31 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan (2014) and Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021). Collectively, these policies require that development, including residential extensions, should result in no significant loss of amenity.
19. It would also comply with guidance contained within the SPD which outlines that extensions should not result in a harmful sense of enclosure or have an overbearing or overly dominant impact on adjoining properties.

Other Matters

20. The appellant has referred to three, what they consider to be similar, developments that have been granted planning permission in the surrounding area. From the evidence submitted, these examples appear to be dwellings and contexts quite different from the appeal property and its context. In the example bearing the most similarity, that being 34 Levensdale Road, several extensions to the property are shown as 'existing' and/or secured through certificates of lawfulness. It also serves to demonstrate the cumulative impact of several extensions to the property.
21. Therefore, although I have had regard to these examples, they do not override the harm I have identified and I give them limited weight in the appeal, which I have, in any event, determined on its own individual planning merits.

Conclusion

22. Although I have found no harm would be caused in respect of living conditions, this does not overcome the harm I have found would be caused to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
23. The proposed development would therefore conflict with the development plan and there are no identified other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict.
24. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR