

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2016

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/16/3156414

251 Brookehowse Road, Bellingham, London, SE6 3TT.

- 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 Robert Czoher against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/16/095417, dated 3 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed front single storey porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed porch on the form and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The Appeal dwelling is located within one of a number of uniformly designed terraces, where most of the inner dwellings have simple and uncluttered front elevations. The detailing of the dwellings in the middle and at the ends of the terraces is more varied and is reflective of the Arts and Crafts movement. The outer and central dwellings reinforce the symmetry of the individual terraces. The symmetry of the terraces is further reinforced by the absence of enclosed porches and the uniformly sized small front gardens set behind boundary hedges. These terraces make a valuable contribution to the sense of rhythm as well as the spacious and uncluttered character and appearance of the street scene and the area.
 4. The host dwelling is consistent with and contributes to the uniform and uncluttered character and appearance of the terrace in which it is located. In particular, it has a matching flush brick finished front elevation and the position and size of its windows and door reflect that of the adjacent dwellings.
 5. Some of the other terraces in the locality lack the detailing of those influenced by the Arts and Crafts movement and have larger front gardens. Generally, they are less sensitive to change and in some instances the addition of porches has improved their appearance. Accordingly, whilst a number of porches have
-

been introduced within the area, the success with which they have blended in with their host terrace and the street scene has depended on the character and appearance of the terrace, as well as the size, form and appearance of the porches. They serve to highlight the importance of assessing each scheme on its individual merits and in light of the prevailing planning policies.

6. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), states that new development should respond to local character and history. It should reflect the identity of local surroundings and add to the overall quality of the area. Together, policy 15 of the Lewesham Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Core Strategy) and policies DM30 and DM31 of the Lewisham Local Development Framework Development Management Policies Local Plan (Local Plan) seek the highest quality design. Extensions should respect the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics and detailing of existing buildings and use high quality matching or complementary materials.
7. In relation to porches the Councils Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) advises they should reflect the predominant character of the area. Their form and design should take account of the most appropriate position, size and height which would complement the host building.
8. The proposed porch would stretch across half of the width of the host dwelling and would have an uncharacteristic fully hipped roof. It would project some 1.75 metres into the small front garden and its ridge line would be out of alignment with the first floor window above. As a consequence the proposed porch would dominate the front of the host dwelling and would be totally out of keeping with the overall character and appearance of the terrace and the street scene.
9. It is acknowledged that a porch could be built within the current permitted development tolerances. However, any such porch would be materially smaller than the proposed porch, including its width, depth and height. As such, it would likely be less dominant and would better respect the proportions and form of the host dwelling and the terrace.
10. Finally, the harm that would be caused by the proposed porch would outweigh the benefits for the Appellant that would result from the space and improved insulation that would be provided by the porch. In addition, this harm is not a matter that could be satisfactorily addressed through the imposition of conditions.
11. I conclude that the proposed porch would materially and unacceptably harm the form and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with policy 15 of the Core Strategy, policies DM30 & DM31 of the Local Plan, the SPD and the NPPF.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR