



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/23/3325669

13 Honley Road, Lewisham, London SE6 2HZ

- 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 Robin and Fabiane Lee-Perrella against the decision of the London Borough of Lewisham Council
 - The application Ref DC/23/130470, dated 21 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is remodelling of the existing ground and first floor layout with rear extensions to the ground and first floors and new side access to the basement from the rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for remodelling of the existing ground and first floor layout with rear extensions to the ground and first floors and new side access to the basement from the rear garden at 13 Honley Road, Lewisham, London SE6 2HZ, in accordance with the terms of the application, DC/23/130470, dated 21 February 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 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 plans: 2245-01, 2245-150, 2245-151, 2245-152, 2245-250, 2245-251, 2245-252 and 2245-351.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on:
 - The character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.
 - The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal dwelling is a detached, London stock brick two storey Victorian house. It has a good sized front and rear gardens and sits on the inside of a 90 degree bend in the street. It is in an immediate local area predominantly made

- up of similarly scaled houses, but with variety in their architectural expression and materials. This area is adjacent to Catford centre.
4. The proposal is for rear extensions and alterations that includes integrating the existing single storey lean-to storage structure with the existing two storey outrigger. This would be clad in off white raked render, with red painted render panels above a double aluminium door on its rear elevation. On the side of the existing outrigger that faces towards the street, an open garden structure in a painted red finish, with a substantial vertical column finished in smooth concrete is proposed, which would shade an external terrace area.
 5. A part one part two storey rear extension would replace the existing small conservatory to the side of the existing outrigger. At ground floor level this would be set back slightly from the rear elevation of the integrated storage structure. At first floor level it would extend approximately to half the depth of the existing two storey outrigger and would open onto a roof terrace above the ground floor part. The first floor part would be finished in blue fibre cement board and would terminate in a two pitch 'saw-tooth' form. The terrace would have an upstand in a dusty red finished fibre cement board with painted balustrade above, with a full height timber screen to the side facing 15 Honley Road (No.15).
 6. The Council have acknowledged that they do not find that the form bulk, scale and massing of the proposal would result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area. As the ground floor elements of the proposal are modest in scale and the first floor elements are recessed between the existing outrigger and a large rear extension to No.15, I see no reason to demur from this conclusion.
 7. The proposed materials and finishes, whilst generally colourful do reflect its form and expression. Whilst these do not reflect the materials used in the existing dwelling, this appears to be a rigorous design choice, which would allow the existing building and the extensions and alterations to be read as two pieces of high quality design that sit together. This would allow the original house to be the primary feature, whose visual integrity would remain intact, whilst the proposal would read as secondary and subordinate additions and alterations. As such the proposal would read as a complimentary addition to the appeal dwelling.
 8. Given the rear location of the proposal and that the first floor element is set between the existing rear outrigger and the large rear extension to No.15, it would only be partially visible from that part of the street to the side of the appeal dwelling. In these views the colour and finishes of the proposal would not, therefore, be visually disruptive and discordant to the street scene, which does reflect a wide variety of materials and finishes.
 9. The proposal would, therefore, read as visually interesting rather than incongruous, overly prominent or dominating. The proposal would, therefore, accord with design guidance set out in the Lewisham Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019), which sets out that such proposals should demonstrate exceptional design quality due to their visual prominence.
 10. Whilst concerns have been raised by the Council as to the quality of the materials, finishes and their life expectancy, such concrete, render panels and

materials and painted finishes are regularly used for many different types of buildings. I note that the relatively new, large extension to the rear of No.15 appears to be finished in a single unbroken field of render in white, with body coloured or painted finish.

11. Good life expectancy of materials and finishes, such as that proposed, is also a product of timely maintenance and is not necessarily an inherent characteristic of the materials or finishes themselves. As such, I do not find that the proposal necessarily presents an inherent risk to the longer term visual quality or integrity of the appeal dwelling or streetscape.

Living Conditions

12. Currently rear views of neighbouring gardens are afforded from the first floor rear windows of the gardens to neighbouring properties. This is reciprocated by the overlooking of the garden to the appeal dwelling from neighbouring properties.
13. The proposed first floor roof terrace would allow for a greater opportunity for overlooking than currently exists of the rear gardens of 11 and 15A and 15B Honley Road. However, given the rearward only nature of these views the presence of the large extension at the rear of No.15 and the separation distances involved, the degree of overlooking afforded by the proposal would not impact on privacy. The resulting degree of overlooking would, therefore, be that to be expected in a developed residential area of this type and would not be materially different to the existing situation.
14. The proposed roof terrace would sit at a higher level than the area of rear garden that it would replace. This would be accessed from a bedroom area and would be enclosed to the sides and, given the distances to neighbouring windows and gardens, I do not find that, when in normal use, it would inherently result in any greater noise nuisance than the use of the existing garden. The proposal would, therefore, accord with the design guidance with regard to noise nuisance set out in the Lewisham Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019).
15. For the reasons given above, I do not find that the proposal would result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area and would not materially harm the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers. As such the proposal would accord with policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy (2021) policies DM30, DM31 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan (2014), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (the NPPF). These collectively seek to ensure that development is of a high standard of design and that extensions respect and/or complement the original building and sympathetic to local character and do not undermine the quality of life of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Conditions

16. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions should I allow the appeal. I have not included the suggested condition requiring the submission and approval of a detailed schedule of all materials and finished prior to construction above ground level. The materials and finishes are detailed in the plans submitted; therefore, such a condition would not be necessary or

reasonable for the rear extensions and alterations to a dwelling of the of the scale proposed. As such, it fails the test for conditions set out in the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance.

17. Along with the standard condition for the time limit on implantation of the development, in the interests of design quality I have included a condition requiring compliance with approved plans.

Conclusion

18. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR