

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2020

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/20/3255263

71 Oldstead Road, Bromley BR1 5RN

- 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 Alex Martin on behalf of an unnamed Applicant against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/20/116006, dated 4 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to an end of terrace property which sits on the corner of Oldstead Road and Southview Road. The local area is predominantly residential in character and it is home to properties of a range of styles.
 4. The appeal dwelling, along with the dwelling on the opposite side of the junction, No. 69 Oldstead Road, are set a comfortable distance from the highway at first floor level. This arrangement gives the junction with Southview Road a noticeably open and spacious feel which contributes positively to the overall character and appearance of the street scene.
 5. The proposed first floor extension would sit above an existing single storey addition at the side of the appeal dwelling. The roof of the extension would be set below the ridge of the main section of the host dwelling and it would also be set back from the principal elevation. However, the extension would be deeper than the host dwelling and it would 'wrap around' part of the rear elevation. Considerable bulk and massing would be introduced to the side and rear of the dwelling and the first floor side extension would protrude beyond the defined building line of the dwellings of Southview Road.
-

6. As a result, I am of the view that the proposed extension would be an overly large and unduly prominent addition. It would not sit subordinately against the host dwelling and it would have a much greater impact on the feeling of spaciousness at the junction than the existing single storey addition. These harmful effects would not be adequately mitigated by the presence of a mature tree within the pavement along the side of the appeal property.

Other considerations

7. I have been referred to several two storey side extensions within the locality, but I do not know the precise circumstances behind the examples highlighted. In any event, I have considered the proposed extension before me on its individual merits, taking into account the specific context within which it would sit.
8. It is argued that the proposal amounts to the efficient use of land in a sustainable urban environment and it would provide enlarged and improved accommodation which would assist the Appellant's partner who has restricted mobility. Whilst I fully sympathise with this situation, the extension is likely to remain long after it ceases to be a material consideration. Moreover, there is no suggestion that the proposal before me is the only way that such benefits could be achieved.
9. Finally, I am mindful that disappointment has been expressed by the Appellant with the manner in which the Council dealt with the planning application along with the advice given at the pre-application stage. However, these are not matters for me to consider.

Overall Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed first floor side extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits. In such terms, it conflicts with policy 15 of the adopted Local Development Framework Core Strategy, policy 30 and 31 of the Development Management Local Plan and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document titled '*Alterations and Extensions*', which collectively promote high quality design which is appropriate to its context.
11. The arguments advanced in favour of the proposal do not outweigh this harm and policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR