



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2024

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/23/3325343

100 Melbourne Grove, Southwark, London SE22 8QY

- 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 LBX East Dulwich Ltd against the decision of the London Borough of Southwark Council.
 - The application Ref 22/AP/4369, dated 23 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a part one/part two storey side and rear extension with loft conversion incorporating hip to gable roof enlargement and rear dormer addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Subsequent to the Council's decision on the application to which this appeal relates, the Government published the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 19 December 2023. I consider that there have been no major changes relevant to the main issue in this appeal. It will therefore not prejudice any party by making my decision with regard to the revised Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a two storey late Victorian semi-detached house with a rear outrigger, which forms part of a short terrace on 3 similar properties. It is located at the corner of the junction of Melbourne Grove with Lytcroft Grove, onto which the main entrance of the appeal dwelling fronts. The Local area is made up of a variety of two and three storey brick built properties with traditional roof forms, lending to an established traditional residential character.
5. Apart from the appeal dwelling, the majority of the remainder of the appeal plot is currently taken up with a variety of storage buildings and structures, which speak of a previous business use, but which are now ancillary to the appeal dwelling. A gated driveway from Lytcroft Grove runs at the rear of the

- plot, where it extends and wraps around the rear gardens of the short terrace of which the appeal dwelling forms part, whilst the street frontages of the appeal dwelling are surrounded by a shallow front garden with boundary wall.
6. The proposal involves the removal of those workshop and storage buildings and structures that are attached to the side and rear of the appeal dwelling, however the existing largest building, which appears to have originally been a garage/workshop would be retained and would sit as a detached building. The proposed single storey flat roofed rear extension would be to the same length of the existing rear outrigger and would extend to the boundary of the appeal dwelling with the adjoining house in the terrace. This would infill an existing small rear yard space but would be substantially screened by the retained garage building and would not be visible from the public realm.
 7. The part one/part two storey side extension would have a five sided canted floor plan and would front mainly onto Lytcroft Road. It would be set back from the highway boundary wall, allowing for a continuation of the garden space to create a wrap-around garden. At ground level the proposed extension would be a mainly glazed floor to ceiling, with some timber screening, which would match the timber used for cladding the set-back flat roofed first floor. This first floor extension would have more traditionally positioned and form of windows to its side and rear.
 8. A wraparound projecting canopy is proposed between the first and second floors, which would also connect to the proposed rear extension. The form, design and materials of this extension would stand in stark and unsympathetic contrast with the traditional brick built Victorian appeal dwelling, which sits prominently on its corner site, reflecting the established character of the area.
 9. The scale of the proposed side extension, the proposed visually heavy canopy and massing of its flat roofed first floor would also result in it appearing as a dominating, rather than secondary addition to the appeal dwelling. The effect of the proposed side extension would, therefore, be as an over-scaled, discordant, and incongruous addition that would not appear as subservient to the appeal dwelling.
 10. Although the appeal dwelling benefits from a certificate of lawful development¹, for a similar rear dormer roof extension and hip to gable alteration as that proposed, The additional bulk of the proposed hip to gable alteration would only add to the visually bulky scale and dominating effect of the proposed side extension, which would result in the appeal dwelling appearing cramped on its site and to not reflect the established character and appearance of the local area.
 11. The appellant has drawn my attention to applications and constructed examples for extensions and buildings in the local area, including an infill development at 61D Melbourne Grove and side extensions at 30 Hawkside Road, 1a Ivanhoe Road and 63 Blenheim Grove. I find that these vary considerably in design, scale and/or context between each other, as well as to the appeal proposal. These would have been considered on their own individual merits and I have done likewise with my consideration of the appeal proposal, which is a main tenet of the planning system. I have therefore only afforded these examples limited weight in my considerations.

¹ Planning Ref: 22/AP/1680

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area. This would not accord with the design advice set out in the Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2011) 2015 Technical Update and would conflict with Policies P13, P14 of the Southwark Plan 2019-2036 (2022), Policy D3 of the London Plan and Paragraph 135 of the Framework. These collectively seek development, including extensions, that are of high quality design, take site context into consideration and integrate with their local area.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR