



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 February 2024

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19.03.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/23/3331573

56 Bankhurst Road, Lewisham, London SE6 4XN

- 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 Zac Campbell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application ref. DC/23/131825, dated 8 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2023.
 - The proposal is for the demolition of existing garage extension and construction of a single story rear extension to replace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage extension and construction of a single story rear extension to replace at 56 Bankhurst Road, Lewisham, London SE6 4XN in accordance with the terms of the application ref. DC/23/131825, dated 8 June 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: site location plan, P003, P004, P005.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with those indicated on the application form.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on a) the character and appearance of the dwelling; and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of 54 and 58 Bankhurst Road in respect of outlook and overbearing impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached, two-storey house on Bankhurst Road with off-street parking to the front. The streetscene is residential in nature, and consists of dwellings of broadly similar scale and design. Blythe Hill Fields recreation ground lies to the rear.

4. The proposed ground floor rear addition would be visible within the local area from adjoining rear gardens. Although it would span the width of the plot, the scale of the scheme would be in proportion to the size of the host building. The boxy design, whilst perhaps not ideal aesthetically, would be tempered to a degree by the monopitch inset feature to one side that would serve to articulate the rear elevation.
5. In reaching my conclusion on this matter I have also had regard to the existing single storey elements on site; their hotchpotch nature and ageing, irregular appearance detract from the character of the building and the replacement scheme would be an improvement in this respect. Moreover, I am mindful that a prior approval application has been granted at the site for a similar rear extension to that proposed by this appeal. In my view, the development would not have a materially greater impact above and beyond that which could be constructed.
6. Drawing the above together, the proposed extension would assimilate with the character and appearance of the dwelling. It would therefore be consistent with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 (LonP), Policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy June 2011 (CS), Policies DM 30 and DM 31 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan November 2014 (LP), and the Council's Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD). Cumulatively these seek to ensure development is of an acceptable scale and design. It would also meet with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Living conditions

7. The existing rear sections presently create a considerable extent of development that dominates the outlook from the rear openings of 54 Bankhurst Road and the environment in and around the patio and back garden. Whilst the height of the appeal proposal would be greater, the rearward projection would be reduced. On balance, I find that the scheme would not be materially worse than the existing state of affairs.
8. Although the built form would run along the common border with no.58, the rearward extent on this boundary would be relatively modest and the height would not substantially exceed the existing fence panels. Therefore the overall impact would not be oppressive. Once more I have also had regard to the permitted prior approval application, which has granted the monopitch inset element in this position.
10. I consider that there would be no detrimental impact upon to the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties in relation to outlook and overbearing impact. This would be in accordance with Policy D3 of the LonP, Policy 15 of the CS, Policies DM 30 and DM31 of the LP and the SPD. Together these seek to ensure that there is no significant loss of amenity to adjoining houses and their back gardens as a result of residential extensions. It would also be consistent with the advice in the Framework, which seeks to secure safe and healthy living conditions.

Conditions

11. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the

standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty. A condition requiring external materials in accordance with those on the application form would provide for a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

12. I allow the appeal having regard to the foregoing arguments and all other matters raised.

C Hall

INSPECTOR