



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/23/3316791

160 Wellmeadow Road, London SE6 1HP

- 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 Hok Chung against the decision of the London Borough of Lewisham Council.
 - The application Ref DC/22/128716, dated 6 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is a rear single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear single storey extension at 160 Wellmeadow Road, London SE6 1HP in accordance with the terms of the application DC/22/128716, dated 6 October 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following condition[s]:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: PROP_01

Main Issues

2. From the material submitted for the purposes of this appeal and my site visit the main issues are:
 - Whether the submitted plans allow for assessment of the proposal.
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area; and
 - The effect of living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Reasons

Plans

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey terraced house, located in an area of similar terraced properties. To the rear is an existing conservatory type extension that would be demolished to accommodate the proposed single storey rear extension. The plans provided indicate that the proposal would project approximately 4.0 metres from the rear of the appeal dwelling, aligning with and adjacent to an existing extension at the rear of the neighbouring

house at 158 Wellmeadow road (No.158). The proposal would be wider than the existing conservatory and would extend across just over half the width of the appeal dwelling.

4. The submitted plans indicate that the proposed extension would be approximately 3.8 Metres in height to the roof ridge and approximately 3.05 Metres to the eaves. This matches the height of the existing rear conservatory. As well as having these dimensions shown on the submitted drawings, these drawings are scaled. The submitted plans show that the roof ridge of the proposal would reach to the same point on the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling as that of the existing conservatory.
5. Although I note that the appellant has provided confirmation with regard to the retention and extension of an existing raised patio as part of their appeal submission, I find that the submitted drawings in themselves provide adequate scaling, noted dimensions and visual reference information, to allow for a proper assessment of the proposals.

Character and appearance

6. As the height of the proposal and the terminating point of its roof ridge would match that of the existing conservatory, from my site visit it was apparent that the proposal would have a similar scale. The proposal would therefore, similarly, appear as a subordinate addition to the appeal dwelling. It would also appear to match the height and scale of other rear extensions in the area, including that at No.158. As such the proposal would reflect the character and appearance of the local area and would not appear as a poorly massed addition within this local context.
7. For these reasons I find that the proposal would generally accord with the relevant design guidance set out in the Lewisham Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (the SPD) and would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area.

Living Conditions

8. The height of the proposal and the terminating point of its roof ridge would match that of the existing conservatory. From my site visit it was apparent that the proposal would have a similar visual impact as the existing conservatory when viewed from neighbouring properties.
9. Given that the proposal would reach to the same height on the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling as this existing conservatory and would appear to reflect the scale and massing of other extensions in the local area, I do not find that it would be experienced as an overbearing presence by the occupiers of neighbouring residential dwellings.
10. Rather, I find that due to its height and scale and the presence of other similar extensions in the local area, the proposal would have a benign presence within its local context and would not be experienced as enclosing, intrusive or oppressive. The proposal would not, therefore, result in any significant harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.
11. For these reasons I find that the proposal would accord with policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy (2021), policy DM31 of the Lewisham Development

Management Local Plan (2014) and paragraph 126 and 130 of the National planning Policy Framework (2021). These collectively seek to ensure that developments are of a high standard of design and integrate with the local area and do not undermine the quality of life of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Conditions

12. I have included the standard condition relating to the timing of the implementation of development and to ensure design quality I have attached conditions requiring compliance with approved Plan.

Conclusion

13. The appeal should be allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR