



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2023

by J Wellstead BA(Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/23/3318157

21 Robert Lowe Close, Lewisham, London SE14 5QB

- 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 Afrim Ratkoceri against the decision of London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/22/129240, dated 13 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is alteration to the existing front porch to increase the size.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alteration to the existing front porch to increase the size at 21 Robert Lowe Close, Lewisham, London SE14 5QB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/22/129240, dated 13 November 2022, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 22-72-PLO1, 2272-PLO2, 2272-SO1, and 2272-SO2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the alteration to the existing front porch, hereby permitted, shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. 21 Robert Lowe Close is a two-storey, mid-terrace dwelling in a residential cul-de-sac. While the buildings are of a predominantly similar style, there is significant variation in the design, size and style of porches in the immediate area. Like many of its neighbours, the appeal site is set back from the road with an enclosed front garden. It is also positioned towards the end of the cul-de-sac with a low degree of prominence in the street scene.
4. The proposed porch would be inset from the boundary, set down below the first-floor window and of comparable height to the scheme at the neighbouring property, resulting in a development which would look proportionate and be visually subordinate to the host building.

5. The appeal scheme would be of similar materials to the existing porch, retain the existing position of the front entrance, and features an extensive use of glass in the design resulting in a visually lightweight structure which would not harm the form or architectural characteristics of the host property.
6. While the appeal scheme is different to others nearby, the extensive mix of porch treatments, including the scheme of comparable width at No. 1 Robert Lowe Close, mean that it would not look out of place in such a varied context.
7. The scheme would also be partially screened by the hard and soft boundary treatments that are typical of the vicinity, including at the appeal site. The length of the front garden at the appeal site, resultant set back from the road, partial screening and existence of an extensive mix of porch designs in the vicinity mean the scheme would not have a detrimental impact on the street scene.
8. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or local area. It would therefore comply with Policy 15 High Quality Design for Lewisham local development framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document June 2011, DM Policy 30 Urban Design and Local Character and DM Policy 31 Alterations and Extensions to Existing Buildings including Residential Extensions of the Lewisham Local Development Framework Development Management Local Plan, November 2014. These policies seek to ensure - amongst other matters - that developments are of high quality and standard of design and are appropriate to their setting. It would also align with the objectives of the Lewisham Local Plan Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2019, which seeks to ensure - amongst other matters - that developments do not unbalance a building, create undue prominence and/or disrupt the continuity of a terrace or group.

Conditions

9. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition to provide certainty, as well as a materials condition to ensure it reflects the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having taken all the matters raised into account, I conclude that the proposed porch would comply with the development plan as a whole and the appeal should be allowed.

J Wellstead

INSPECTOR