



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/23/3326829

88 Canonbie Road, Lewisham, London SE23 3AG

- 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 Munur Djemil against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref 23/13126, dated 24 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "Extension to existing double storey over existing garage, with the introduction of recessed balcony space at front. Hip-roof to gable introducing Juliet balcony with rear dormer".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposals on:
 - (i) the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene, and
 - (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 86 Canonbie Road, with particular regard to outlook and privacy.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house situated on a steeply sloping site. It includes a garage and 2-storey extension to the side, the latter being set back a significant distance behind the front elevation. At the rear both the appeal property and its attached pair, 90 Canonbie Road, feature full-width single-storey extensions. At the time of my visit a full-width, flat-roofed dormer was being constructed at the rear of the No. 90.
4. Despite the many additions and alterations to the pair of houses over the years, the street frontage and hipped roof form maintains a high degree of symmetry, which is mirrored by the neighbouring pair of semi-detached houses, 92 and 84 Canonbie. Whilst these two pairs of houses possess a high degree of uniformity the street as a whole features a wide range of housing types.

5. The proposal would comprise a 2-storey side extension, the expansion of the roof to form a side-facing gable and the formation of a flat-roofed dormer to occupy almost the entirety of the expanded rear roof slope. The ridge of the expanded roof would be set below that of the existing main ridge and the front elevation of the side extension would be set back slightly behind the main front elevation. However, due to their siting, height and massing these elements would be highly conspicuous and would severely unbalance the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses. It would also detract from the relative uniformity of the group of 4 houses of which the appeal property forms one end.
6. The dormer would be wider than the dormer under construction at No.90 and, unlike the neighbouring dormer, would be set away from the party wall between the pair of houses. As a consequence of its siting and bulk this aspect of the proposal would result in an overly prominent, unbalanced and incongruous rear roof form.
7. I therefore conclude that, due to its siting, height and bulk the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. As such it fails to accord with Policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy (2011) (CS) and Policy DM31 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan (2014) (LP). Amongst other matters these policies seek to ensure that developments are of a high standard of design and integrate with the local area. The proposal also conflicts with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) and the Council's Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD). The latter I note states that extensions should be subordinate to the original dwelling and dormers should sensitively relate to the existing roof form and not contribute to a group of mismatched roof forms.

Living Conditions

8. The proposal would include opening glazed doors and a Juliet balcony at third floor level in the flank elevation. This would enable extensive overlooking of the rear garden of 86 Canonbie Road resulting in clear and substantial harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of this property.
9. The proposed roof level additions would result in a significant increase in the height and size of the flank elevation of the appeal property directly next to the boundary of the site shared with No.86, which is set on lower ground. However, the additions would only extend a small distance beyond the rear building line of No.86 and therefore there would be no material impact on outlook from rear windows and limited impact in the garden. In this particular respect I am satisfied that the proposal would not harm living conditions.
10. However, due to the effect of the proposed side-facing aperture the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.86. For this reason the proposal fails to comply with CS Policy 15, LP Policy 31 and the provisions of the SPD insofar as their objectives seek to ensure new development responds to the local context and does not harm residential amenity.

Other Matters

11. I note the appellant's need for additional space. However, there is nothing before me to demonstrate that this need necessitates the form and scale of development proposed and cannot be achieved through development that is less harmful. As such I attribute limited weight to this matter.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR