

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2024

by M Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/24/3341769

11 Sedgeway, Lewisham, London SE6 1JR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Hanif against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref is DC/23/134108.
 - The development proposed is construction of a 2-storey extension to the side, first-floor extension to the rear, single-storey extension to the front and rear, together with alterations and conversion of the garage and new porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The above description of development is taken from the Council's decision notice, rather than the application form, as this more accurately describes the proposed development. The appellant raises no objection to that description, which they have used in their appeal form and statement of case.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one half of a two storey semi-detached pair of dwellings situated in a short row of properties on Sedgeway. The property has a hipped roof and is set back from the road with a garden and driveway to the front, a garage at the side and a single storey extension to the rear.
5. The surrounding area is of established residential character featuring two storey semi-detached and terraced houses. Though many have been extended, there remains some uniformity to the street scene due to linear building lines and regular gaps between properties, together with design features such as bay windows, hipped roofs and front gables, and consistency of external materials comprising brick walls and tiled roofs.
6. The two storey side extension would project to the rear to join onto a first floor rear extension. Single storey extensions are proposed to the front and the rear. As there is an existing hip to gable roof extension to 9 Sedgeway, the sense of symmetry and balance of the semi-detached pair has been undermined. The

gable end above the proposed two storey side extension would reflect the gable end at No 9 and would restore some symmetry to the roofscape of the pair.

7. A substantial addition, the two storey side extension would not be set back from the front of the existing property, nor set in from the side boundary, and the roof would not be set down from the existing ridge line. In addition, its width would appear to be over half the width of the front elevation of the existing property. In these respects, it would not accord with guidance contained in the Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2019).
8. Therefore, as a result of the design of the two storey side extension, there would be no relief between the existing building and the extension, which would fail to achieve a subservient relationship to the host property. Furthermore, due to the lack of relief from the side boundary, the two storey side extension would have a cramped appearance.
9. During my visit I could see there were other two storey side extensions in the area, some of which are of similar scale and design to the appeal proposal, notably at 8 Sedgeway opposite. However, I do not have the details of the planning history of these other cases before me and many appear to have been in-situ some time and will have been approved prior to the SPD. Moreover, some of the extensions are not sympathetic to the area's character and are not good examples to follow. Therefore, whilst I have had regard to these other developments, they do not lead me to a different conclusion on the main issue.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Thus, it would conflict with Policies D1 and D3 of the London Plan, Policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy Development Plan Document, Policies 30 and 31 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan, and the SPD. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure a high standard of design which is sensitive to the local context and responds to local character. The proposal would also conflict with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, where this seeks to ensure well-designed development which is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

11. While I sympathise with the appellant's wish to create enlarged accommodation, this is a private benefit which does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

12. The proposal does not accord with the development plan and there are no other considerations that indicate I should take a different decision other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR