



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2023

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/22/3309572

66 Southbrook Road, Lewisham, London SE12 8LL

- 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 G Perretta against the decision of the London Borough of Lewisham Council.
 - The application Ref DC/22/128141, dated 23 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the Lee Manor Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a 2 storey double fronted end of terrace house with a hipped roof and a large attached flat roofed side garage. It forms part of a terrace of large and decorative Victorian houses and is located at the corner of Southbrook Road and Manor Lane. It sits on a street made up of similar generously proportioned Victorian terraced and semi-detached Houses and exemplifies the houses which define much of the character and appearance of the local area and the CA, thereby contributing to its significance.
4. The CA is a heritage asset to which I have a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
5. The proposal appears to be identical to a proposal for which planning permission was previously refused¹. This is for a first floor side extension that would sit above the existing attached garage. This would align with the front elevation of the garage that is slightly set back from that of the main elevation of the appeal dwelling. It would be slightly set in from the side elevation of the garage and would align with the rear elevation of the main house. It would, however, be set in more substantially from the rear elevation of the garage,

¹ Planning Ref: DC/21/124476

- which extends beyond that of the main house. It would be constructed in London stock brick with a slate roof to match the appeal dwelling.
6. The proposal would not replicate the acute angled junction of the side and rear elevations of the garage but would rather have a set in bunted corner elevation. This would result in a complex hipped roof form that would join to that of the dwelling. Due to the size and scale of the proposed first floor extension and the concomitant size and complexity of its proposed roof form, the proposal would be a prominent addition to the appeal dwelling and would be extensively visible in views from along Southbrook Road and Manor Lane.
 7. The scale of the proposed first floor extension and its roof would not reflect the existing symmetry of the main house and would result in the appeal dwelling appearing to be visually unbalanced. This would be accentuated by the complex design and massing of the proposed roof. As such, the proposal would fail to appear as subordinate to the appeal property but would rather appear as a dominant and incongruous addition.
 8. This would be apparent in street views of the appeal dwelling, where it would result in a bulky appearance to the appeal dwelling and a visual encroachment, which would result in a greater sense of enclosure at the corner and Southbrook Road and Manor Lane. The proposal would reduce the existing sense of openness in the street frontage of Manor Lane, where the established first floor building line is set considerably back from the street frontage. The proposal would not, therefore, reflect the generous spatial characteristics of the CA.
 9. As part of their appeal statement the appellant has set out their argument that the proposal would better meet their family needs. The appellant has not, however, provided me with specific information that would lead me to conclude that the proposal would be the only way in which their specific needs could be met. The benefits identified by the appellant would be primarily of a private nature, resulting from an enlarged property with improved amenity for its occupiers.
 10. The appellant has sought to argue that the proposal would add to the provision of housing in the Council area and an efficient use of available development land. However, whilst the proposal would lead to a larger dwelling, it would not provide any additional residential units that would contribute to reducing the well documented housing need in this part of London.
 11. The appellant has drawn my attention to other approved extensions and development in the local area, including those allowed on appeal. These would have been considered on their own individual merits and I have done likewise in my considerations in determining this appeal.
 12. For the reasons given above the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This would not accord with the design guidance given in section 4.4 the Lewisham Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019) and would conflict with policies 15 and 16 of the Lewisham Core Strategy (2021), Policies DM30, DM31 and DM36 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan (2014), Policy D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These collectively seek to ensure that

development is of high quality design, a key aspect of sustainable development, and have due regard to the importance of preserving or enhancing heritage assets.

13. Although I find the harm to the CA would be considered less than substantial, in accordance with the Framework, great weight should be given to the conservation of those assets. Whilst the proposal would result in a larger property with improved amenity for its occupiers, these are primarily private benefits. I must give considerable importance and weight to the effect on the significance of the CA and substantial weight to the effects on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling that I have identified. I consider that these benefits do not outweigh this harm.

Conclusion

14. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR