



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2024

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/23/3330277

33 Ringmore Rise, Lewisham, London SE23 3DF

- 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 Sally and Matthew Wingate against the decision of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/23/131324, dated 29 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension with garden storage area below.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Following submission of the appeal, the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 19 December 2023 and updated on 20 December 2023. The parts of the Framework most relevant to the appeal have not substantively changed from the previous version. Consequently, this update to national policy does not fundamentally alter the main parties' cases or prejudice their position at appeal, and it is not necessary to seek further comments.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Ringmore Rise is mainly characterised by two-storey detached dwellings of traditional design. The dwellings to the side of the road where No 33 Ringmore Rise is situated are elevated above the level of the highway. The gaps between neighbouring dwellings on this side of the road vary in width, and some dwellings have side extensions which sit close to side boundaries. Most of these extensions take design cues from the fenestration and roof forms of their hosts.
5. No 33 Ringmore Rise has a traditional aesthetic with regular window proportions and tiled pitched roofs. Due to its position set in from the side boundary with No 31 Ringmore Rise, it sits comfortably within its plot. The attached dwelling at No 33a Ringmore Rise forms a two-storey projection to the other side of the appeal dwelling and has a contrasting flat roof. Nevertheless, there is general uniformity across the fenestration of the front elevations of these properties. Overall, the appeal dwelling reflects an overriding order and traditional grain to the buildings on Ringmore Rise.

6. The proposal's width in combination with the high parapet line of its flat roof would give it a bulky appearance. Together with the elongated depth of the front window, the extension would have a contemporary appearance which would not complement the traditional form or window pattern of No 33. The inconsistency between the design elements of the extension and its host would be emphasised due to the dwelling's prominent elevated position above street level.
7. Consequently, while its close position to the side boundary would not be dissimilar to other side extensions on Ringmore Rise, the extension would conflict with the guidance in the Lewisham Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019). This sets out amongst other things that single storey side extensions should sit comfortably with the original building, respect its proportions and that its roof form should complement the character of the original building.
8. In addition, the extension would result in flat roofed projections of varied design and height to either side of No 33. This would make for an unbalanced composite built form and would compound the harm to the appearance and general order of the street.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to an approved development at No 49 Ringmore Rise of comparable design to the appeal proposal¹. However, in that particular instance, the proposal sought to replace a single storey projection which itself had a contrasting roof and window design to its host. The approved side extension at No 9 Ringmore Rise² incorporates fenestration and a hipped roof which reflect the design of that dwelling. Therefore, the material circumstances in those examples are not the same as the appeal proposal. Having regard to the site-specific circumstances described, I am not persuaded that the proposal would be a sympathetic addition to the host dwelling or that it would reflect the prevailing characteristics of Ringmore Rise.
10. I conclude, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it would conflict with the design, context and character requirements of Policy 15 (High quality design for Lewisham) of the Lewisham Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM 30 (Urban design and local character) and DM 31 (Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions) of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan (2014).

Conclusion

11. The proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It therefore conflicts 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. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR

¹ LPA Ref DC/18/107459

² LPA Ref DC/19/113550