The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2019

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/19/3223505

137 Moorside Road, Bromley BR1 5EP

- 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 Dutton, Room at the Top Developments Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
  The application Ref DC/18/108881 dated 11 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2018.
- The development proposed is described as erection of a family dwelling.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development on (i) the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) views towards Downham Fields.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The site comprises a side garden serving a two storey property within a residential area. The properties are predominantly terraced with hipped roof end terraced features. The properties are of uniform materials and appearance, however they have no architectural merit.

4. The proposed development would be of a similar width of the host property, 137 Moorside Road and would extend a row of terraced two storey properties. Whilst rows are predominantly in blocks of 6, 8 or 10 the introduction of another dwelling would not be incongruous to the area as the number of properties in each block is not an obvious feature in the streetscene. There are also examples of blocks not conforming with this pattern nearby.

5. Notwithstanding that the host property has a large front porch which is not a prevailing feature in the area. The proposed development would introduce prominent features into the area such as a single storey mono-pitch roof extending the full width of the front elevation and large rear dormer which would be out of keeping with the surrounding properties.

6. Whilst the appellant contends that the majority of properties in the area have porch, single storey rear extensions, and even full width dormer windows no

substantive details are before me to confirm this. During my site visit these features were not obvious in the streetscene.

7. My attention has been drawn by the appellant to No's 97 and 101 Moorside Road which both have gable frontages, these properties do differ from the prevailing character of the area, nonetheless they include a pitched roof detail which is different to the proposed development. The inclusion of a gable roof would be dominant in the streetscene and inconsistent with the surrounding properties which are typified by hipped/pitched roof end terrace features.

8. The appellant has referred to their permitted development rights as a potential fall-back position, however I nothing before me to suggest they would genuinely pursue this option if the appeal failed or that such a scheme would be similar to, or materially worse than, what is currently proposed.

9. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. There is conflict with Policy 15 of Lewisham local development framework, Core Strategy, Development plan document (2011) (the Core Strategy), and Policies 30 and 33 of the Lewisham local development framework, Development Management Local Plan (2014) (the Local Plan) which amongst other things seek to achieve high quality design which relates successfully and sensitively to the existing design quality of the streetscape.

Views towards Downham Field

10. The site lies adjacent a pedestrian access between Moorside Road and Downham Fields, a large area of public open space to the rear of the site. A linear piece of open space also bounds the pedestrian route, adjacent 143 Moorside Road.

11. There is an existing high boundary enclosure around the site which defines the area as private space. Notwithstanding this delineation the area does provide opportunity for limited views into Downham Fields.

12. The proposed development would reduce the openness of the access and reduce the view over the site towards Downham Fields. However, the adjacent open space and pedestrian access would retain a separation between built forms which would distinguish the area as an access point and maintain views into Downham Fields. The access into Downham Fields would be well defined and views whilst restricted would not in my view be compromised by the proposal. I find that the proposed development would not harm the open and green quality of the area.

13. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm views toward Downham Fields. There is no conflict with Policy 33 of the Local Plan in relation to this main issue which amongst other things seek developments which respond to the character and issues of the street frontage.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has provided a photograph detailing fly tipping on the area of open space adjacent the pedestrian access into Downham Fields. At the time of my site visit the appeal site and the surrounding area did not appear to be suffering from anti-social behaviour such as fly tipping. Notwithstanding this I have no substantive evidence to persuade me that any antisocial behaviour

that may be experienced would be abated as a result of the proposed development.

Planning Balance

15. I have concluded that there would not be harm to the views towards Downham Fields, however this does not outweigh the harm I have identified in terms of the unacceptable effect on character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR