



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2023

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

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 27 April 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/22/3309561**

**32 Knoyle Street, London SE14 6HW**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under a development order under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO).
  - The appeal is made by Mr Jacob Stringer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
  - The application Ref DC/22/127642, dated 9 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2022.
  - The development proposed is described on the application form as “- The additional floor has been designed to follow the existing architectural vocabulary - The materials will match that of the existing dwelling and surrounding buildings; refer to application drawings”.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matter

2. Various descriptions of the proposal have been given. I have taken the description in the heading above from the application form as this represents the basis on which the application was submitted.

### Background and Main Issue

3. The Council’s first reason for refusal refers to insufficient evidence being submitted regarding overshadowing. However, in correspondence with the appellant, the Council acknowledges that sufficient evidence has been provided on this issue and that it would not defend this reason for refusal.
4. On that basis, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

### Reasons

5. The appeal site is part of a terrace of 3-storey dwellings which are of a similar design and appearance. This is part of a wider residential estate which includes buildings of varying scales and designs. Despite the variation in the designs of buildings in this estate, the terrace containing the appeal site is of a cohesive scale and appearance. Due to the visual contribution of the appeal site to this terrace, I do not consider it to be appropriate to consider the external appearance of the dwellinghouse in isolation. The relationship with the terrace

is, in this case, relevant to the consideration of the effect of the development on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

6. The proposal would include the creation of an additional storey which would reflect the arrangement of the existing uppermost floor which is set back from the main front elevation of the terrace. The windows of the extension would be of a similar arrangement and design as those on the first floor.
7. However, the proposed upward extension would appear as an incongruous addition to the consistent design of the roof of the terrace. The projection above the roof on this single element of the terrace would appear as a jarring feature which would contrast uncomfortably with this relatively cohesive terrace. The use of matching materials, window design and roof slope would do little to mitigate for the clumsy design of the proposal.
8. The appellant refers to the variation in building designs on the estate, including stepped terraces and 4-storey maisonette blocks. However, even within this varied context, the proposal would appear an obtrusive addition detracting from the consistency and symmetry of the roof form of the host terrace.
9. Reference is also made to the history of development in the wider area, including the Georgian terrace of Albury Street which includes a number of historical upward extensions. However, these examples do not create a prevailing context which would justify the design of the appeal proposal within the host terrace. Should approval be granted for this initial extension, there is no certainty that proposals would come forward for neighbouring properties in the terrace to be extended in a similar manner.
10. It is inevitable that permitted development rights to extend buildings upward will have some impact on the appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. However, this does not negate the requirement to address the conditions placed on development permitted under Class AA, including the consideration of external appearance.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that significant harm would be caused to the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the area. The GPDO sets out that regard should be had to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) so far as relevant to the subject matter of the prior approval. Due to the identified harm, the proposal would conflict with the Framework in respect of achieving well-designed places.
12. Insofar as they are relevant to this issue, the proposal would also conflict with Policy 15 of the Core Strategy 2011 and DM Policies 30 and 31 of the Development Management Local Plan 2014 which seek to ensure development of a high quality design, including residential extensions. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice of the Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2019 in respect of the addition of an extra storey to dwellings with a pitched roof.
13. The appellant sets out that the policies quoted by the Council were in place prior to the permitted development right coming into force. However, this does not negate the aims of these policies in respect of matters of design relating to external appearance.

### **Other Matters**

14. The appellant refers to housing need, and the intention to improve the flexibility of family accommodation as part of a housing cooperative. However, these matters do not fall within the remit of this application for prior approval, and in any event would not outweigh the significant harm I have identified.

### **Conclusion**

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

*David Cross*

INSPECTOR