



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2021

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/21/3266893

54 Coniston Road, Bromley 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 Lee Morrison against the decision of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/20/118188, dated 27 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is Erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension and side extension and part first floor side and rear extension with loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the time the proposal was submitted, a new London Plan has been published in March 2021. I have had due regard to the new plan.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an extended larger style detached dwelling located along Coniston Road. It sits amongst other detached and semi-detached houses of similar character to both sides of the road. Whilst the road is largely residential in character, the Bromley Court Hotel is also located close by.
5. From the front elevation, the proposal would significantly alter the appearance of the dwelling as the existing distinctive roof form of two interlocking hipped roofs, with traditional chimney stacks, would be removed and replaced by one substantial roof, with a combination of gable roof with half hips.
6. Overall, the considerable mass and bulk and design configuration in the arrangement proposed, the removal of the chimney stacks and in addition, the use of four roof lights to the front roof plane, would only seek to highlight its discordant appearance. The proportionality of the roof would be lost as a consequence. It would thus not appear as a harmonious addition to the dwelling.

7. Rather, it would appear as an uncharacteristically prominent and incongruous development that would be out of character with the prevailing roof style seen within close quarters of the appeal property. Even if there have been alterations to roofs seen locally elsewhere, these do not precisely resemble the development before me.
8. There may be no set back proposed to the first floor extension, and indeed there are examples of this visible within the street scene. This alone would not lead me to conclude the proposal would be unacceptable. However, it would only contribute to the mass of the roof, leading to a visually obtrusive form of development.
9. To the rear of the dwelling, the proposed large and bulky rear dormer window that would encompass nearly the full width of the roof, and its projection, would dominate the roof slope. A further large single storey extension would only serve to detrimentally alter the original proportions and characteristics of the property. It would not amount to subservient or sympathetic extensions.
10. I understand the desire of the appellant to want to provide increased living accommodation for their family. However, that is not to say this cannot be achieved by other means. There may be elements of the proposal that follow the design of extensions to houses within the street scene. However, they do not share exactly the same characteristics as the proposal before me.
11. To conclude, the proposal would not appear as a subservient extension to the host dwelling, but would detrimentally harm its character and appearance and that of the street scene. It would be contrary to the London Plan 2021, Policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy 2011, and the Development Management Local Plan 2014 policies DM Policy 30 and DM Policy 31, and finally the Council's Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2019 in their combined design aims.

Other Matters

12. Even if the proposal would not lead to harm arising to neighbouring occupants, this is a neutral matter that neither weighs in favour for nor against the proposal.
13. I appreciate the appellant has raised the opportunity to amend the proposal. There may be other extensions described as 'overbearing' by the appellant. However, the precise details are not before me to comment upon and as is my duty, I am required to assess the proposal before me.

Conclusion

14. Therefore, the proposal would lead to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR