
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2016

by Daniel Hartley MTP MBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 05 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/16/3157247
8 Coniston Road, Bromley, London BR1 4JQ

- 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 Fadil Adil against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/15/094251, dated 26 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single storey front extension to extend the garage and to install a front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form as this better describes the appeal proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached house which is located in an established residential area. It includes a two storey addition to the side of the house (garage at ground floor) which is set slightly back from the main front wall of the house and with a lower roofline than the main roof of the property. Consequently, the overall balance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings is suitably retained.
5. Coniston Road is very long and includes a mixture of mainly semi-detached and detached dwellings. However, the appeal property is in a part of Coniston Road which includes mainly semi-detached dwellings: they have imposing bay windows to the front elevations. Whilst there are some exceptions, in the main the dwellings include stand alone and proportionate front porches with side extensions/additions that are either flush or set back

from the front wall of the main dwellings. This gives the area its character and ensures that there is some design uniformity and balance to each pair of semi-detached dwellings.

6. The proposal would bring the garage forward of the front wall of the main house and would be attached to a new porch. Taking into account the forward projection and overall width of the proposed development, coupled with the existing side addition to the original house, I consider that the development would not appear subordinate or sympathetic in scale to the host property. It would detract unacceptably from the overall balance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses.
7. I acknowledge that the appellant has referred me to some similar developments in other parts of Coniston Road, but I do not consider that the examples are of such numbers that the aforementioned character and appearance of the immediate area has fundamentally changed. Notwithstanding the existence of some similar development in Coniston Road, I consider that the proposal would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the street-scene. I am not aware of the exact circumstances which led to some of the other front extensions being allowed, but, in any event, if this appeal were to be allowed it would unacceptably erode the identified character and appearance of the area, and it would be difficult to resist similar proposals in other parts of the street.
8. For the collective reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would have a significantly detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with the design aims of Policies DM30 and DM31 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan 2014; Policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2011; Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 and the Lewisham Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (updated 2012).

Other Matters

9. I have taken into account comments made by other interested parties and most of the issues raised have been addressed above. Comments made by the occupiers of No 10 Coniston Road are noted, but they do not alter my conclusion on the main issue. The Courts have held that the effect of development upon property values is not a material planning consideration and, in any event, I do not have any objective evidence before me to indicate that the proposal would have such an impact.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Daniel Hartley

INSPECTOR