

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2017

**by R C Shrimplin MA(Cantab) DipArch RIBA FRTPI FCI Arb MCIL**

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

**Decision date: 24 February 2017**

---

**Appeal Reference: APP/C5690/D/16/3164809**  
**175 Brookmill Road, London SE8 4JH**

- 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 Vinh Le against the decision of the London Borough of Lewisham Council.
  - The application (reference DC/16/096103, dated 4 April 2016) was refused by notice dated 25 October 2016.
  - The development proposed is described in the application form as “the construction of a mansard roof extension with two dormer windows to the front and rear roof slope”.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main issue

2. The main issue to be determined in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings.

## Reasons

3. Brookmill Road is a busy through route and the appeal site is located at its junction with Leathwell Road, close to a railway bridge that takes railway traffic into central London. The surrounding area is mixed in character, with terraces of interesting historic buildings as well as more modern development.
4. The existing house at 175 Brookmill Road is located at the end of a Victorian terrace, which retains a considerable degree of consistency, in architectural terms, and which makes a positive contribution to the streetscene, though the appeal site does not lie within any conservation area. The existing house turns the corner at the road junction and the front part of the house has a “butterfly” roof, typical of its period, concealed behind a parapet that tops the main front elevation.
5. The appeal proposal would involve the creation of a new “mansard” construction at roof level, over the front part of the existing house. In effect, this would create an additional storey covered mainly by a flat roof but with sloping sections at the edges of the flat roofed area. The new floor would provide a large “loft room” with its own en-suite shower room (and an access stair).

6. Among other things, the 'National Planning Policy Framework' emphasises the aim of "requiring good design" in the broadest sense (notably at Section 7) and it points out the importance of creating an attractive streetscape and maintaining the overall quality of the area.
7. An emphasis on the importance of good design is also to be found in 'The London Plan', notably at Policies 7.4 and 7.6. Local Policies, in turn, point out the importance of good design and attention has been drawn to Policies in the 'Core Strategy' and the 'Development Management Local Plan'. Policy 15 of the adopted Lewisham 'Core Strategy' is concerned with "high quality design for Lewisham" in general terms, while DM Policies 30 and 31 of the Council's 'Development Management Local Plan' are more detailed. Indeed, DM Policy 31 deals specifically with "alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions". Reference has also been made to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on "residential standards" in which paragraph 6.7 deals with "roof extensions" and is a material consideration, though it does not form part of the statutory Development Plan.
8. The proposed rooftop extension would disrupt the line of the existing roof and would be clearly visible in the streetscene, especially as a result of the prominent location of the appeal site at the end of its terrace and at the junction of Brookmill Road and Leathwell Road. The new structure on the roof would be discordant in its context and would introduce an awkward and ungainly element into the streetscene, unsympathetic to the host building. Hence the proposals are contrary to both national and local planning policies (including policies in the Development Plan) and are unacceptable in planning terms.
9. It has been noted that other mansard roofs have been constructed in the area, including a number in Leathwell Road, but development proposals must always be considered on their own merits and, in this case, the harm to the host building and its surroundings clearly outweigh the benefits of the project.
10. Evidently, the appeal site lies within an established urban area, which is "sustainable" in planning terms, and the proposed development would make a useful addition to the existing house. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the visual harm that would be done to the host building and its surroundings clearly outweigh the benefits of the project. Hence, I have concluded that the scheme before me would conflict with both national and local planning policies (including the Development Plan) and that it ought not to be allowed. Although I have considered all the matters that have been raised in the representations, I have found nothing to cause me to alter my decision.

*Roger C Shrimplin*

INSPECTOR