



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2024

by V Simpson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/24/3348240

39 Dacre Park, Lewisham, London SE13 5SQ

- 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 Thomas Winther against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/135289.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Having reviewed the Blackheath Conservation Area plan, I am satisfied that the appeal site is outside of the Blackheath Conservation Area.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, including its effect on the significance of 39 to 47 Dacre Park as a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

4. A 2-storey end of terrace house and its gardens occupy the appeal site. It forms part of a terrace of 5 properties, which the Council has identified as a non-designated heritage asset.
5. One of the general principles identified within DM Policy 37 of the Lewisham Local Plan¹ is to protect the local distinctiveness of the borough by sustaining and enhancing the significance of non-designated heritage assets. This policy also states that the Council will seek to retain and enhance locally listed buildings and structures.
6. The significance of this heritage asset stems in part, from its historic, architectural, and cultural interest as a terrace of early to mid-19th century modest workers cottages, which are a surviving remnant of the Lee working class 'village'. It is also from the particularly attractive and well-proportioned architectural detailing on the front of the cottages. While the terrace has been subject of various rear extensions and alterations, those that can be readily viewed from the nearby public realm, do not detract from the humble scale

¹ Lewisham - Lewisham local development framework – Development Management Local Plan – adopted 26 November 2014

and relatively simple form of the original pitched roof cottages. For these reasons, the appeal site makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

7. While it would not be unduly prominent, the upper portions of the proposed rear extension would be clearly visible by those passing the site on Dacre Park, and from the area to the front of the adjacent garages. Albeit trees and buildings close to the appeal site would interrupt longer views of the development, from those locations that it would be visible, it would read as a bulky and incongruous addition to the host dwelling. This is partly because it would have a flat roof which would be taller than the eaves of that part of the dwelling it would adjoin. It is also because it would detract from the simple form and modest scale of the original cottage. Although the front elevation of the property would remain unaltered, and yellow stock bricks would be used which would match the host dwelling, these measures would not prevent the development from causing harm to the appearance of the dwelling and to the significance of the heritage asset.
8. I have no doubt that the development would help to make the dwelling more spacious, comfortable, energy efficient, and adaptable. However, given the scale of the scheme, these benefits would be small, and only very limited weight can be attributed to each of them. When taken together, these benefits do not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the heritage asset.
9. While the proposed extension would occupy more than 50% of the rear garden, the reasonably sized front garden would be retained, as would a small area to the rear. Moreover, when viewed from the nearby public realm, the extension would, at least partially, be framed by trees. For these reasons the development would not appear to be cramped. However, and despite the variety in the design, scale and form of development in the wider area, these considerations do not lead me away from my previous findings in respect of this main issue.
10. For the reasons previously given, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, including its effect on the significance of 39 to 47 Dacre Park as a non-designated heritage asset. Consequently, it would conflict with policy HC1 of the London Plan², DM policies 30, 31, and 37 of the Local Plan, and policy 15 of the Core Strategy³. Collectively and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that new development is of a high-quality of design, to protect or enhance the historic environment, and to protect the significance of non-designated heritage assets. However, in respect of this main issue, I do not find conflict with DM Policy 36 of the Local Plan, which principally focusses on designated heritage assets and their settings.

Other Matters

11. Although the cottage at the other end of the terrace appears to have been subject of a rear 2 storey extension which is readily visible from the public realm, from the evidence I am unable to understand the basis of its presence. Furthermore, the main part of that dwelling has a significantly deeper span

² The London Plan – The Spatial Development Strategy For Greater London – March 2021.

³ Lewisham – Lewisham local development framework – Core Strategy Development plan document – adopted June 2011.

and a different roof form from the house on the appeal site. While a rear extension may also have been constructed at 41 Dacre Park, this is not readily visible from nearby streets. Moreover, and once again, I do not have enough information to understand the basis of its presence. Consequently, these extensions are not directly comparable with the proposed development, and their presence does not lead me to an alternative view regarding the acceptability of the appeal scheme.

12. Even if the development would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, this would be a neutral consideration.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

V Simpson

INSPECTOR