



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2026

by **A Wright BSc (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/25/3375762

13 Liphook Crescent, Lewisham, London SE23 3BN

- 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 S Smith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/140253.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a ground floor single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 11 Liphook Crescent, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a large, two-storey dwelling on a generous sized plot in a street predominantly characterised by substantial detached houses. Due to their location on a bend in the road, the properties in this part of the street have angled boundaries with sizeable gaps between the buildings, allowing views between them and giving it an open character. Nonetheless, the side extension at 15 Liphook Crescent (No 15) has already reduced the gap between that house and the appeal dwelling.
4. The Council's Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD) recognises that the space between buildings can be an important characteristic of the street scene, allowing views between buildings and preventing enclosure along the street frontage. It states that single storey side extensions should be subordinate to the host property and no wider than half the original frontage width, amongst other things. The SPD also outlines that there may be instances where an extension could be taller than its neighbour, but this is subject to not harming neighbouring properties or the appearance of the house.
5. The proposal is for a flat roof single storey side extension, with a narrower front progressively widening to the rear, providing a garage to allow for two vehicles to

be parked in tandem. Unlike the side addition at No 15, it would follow the line of the angled boundary for its entire length.

6. Due to its position, the appeal scheme would erode the gap and views between the appeal dwelling and 11 Liphook Crescent (No 11). However, given its flat roof and single storey height, space would be maintained between the upper levels of the buildings. Further, from the front, it would appear similar in scale to the existing side extension at No 15. For these reasons, the proposed extension would not unduly harm the open nature of this part of the road.
7. From the street, the proposed addition would appear less than half the width of the original house. Nevertheless, because of its tapered design, the extension would be significantly wider than this to the rear and would have a substantial footprint occupying the entire sizeable area to this side of the dwelling. Due to its overall mass and rear width, the proposed development would be a dominant and bulky addition, failing to appear subordinate to the host building.
8. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to Policy QD9 of the Lewisham Local Plan 2025 (LP) which requires proposals for extensions to have regard to the SPD and to respect the proportion of the original building, amongst other things.

Living conditions

9. The rising topography means that the appeal site sits at a higher level than the adjacent property at No 11, and the two properties lie at an angle to each other. Immediately to the rear of the neighbouring building is a patio, with the rest of the garden sloping down beyond it.
10. The proposed addition would extend around 11.5m along the shared boundary with No 11. The juxtaposition of the appeal property relative to No 11 means that the proposed side extension would project significantly beyond the rear of the adjacent house, close to the neighbouring rear patio. The garage would be 3m above the ground level of the appeal dwelling but would appear higher from the lower lying neighbouring patio.
11. The orientation of the proposed extension relative to No 11 and the absence of openings in its flank wall would ensure no harmful loss of light nor overlooking of the neighbouring occupants. However, due to the height and extent of the wall along the boundary and its proximity to the outdoor sitting area at No 11, the proposed scheme would have an overbearing effect, causing undue harm to the outlook of these neighbouring occupiers when using their rear patio.
12. There is reference to the greater level difference between No 15 and the appeal site compared with the appeal property and No 11. Nevertheless, as only part of the side addition at No 15 runs along the mutual boundary with the appeal site, its effects on neighbouring living conditions are not comparable with the proposal currently before me.
13. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 11, with particular regard to outlook. This would be contrary to Policy QD7 of the LP where it requires proposals to ensure no unacceptable adverse impact on amenity, including ensuring adequate provision for outlook.

Other Matters

14. The National Planning Policy Framework seeks the effective use of land, but the proposal would fail to meet its requirements that developments provide good design and a high standard of amenity for existing users.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

A Wright

INSPECTOR