



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2024

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/23/3334849

11A Brownhill Road, LONDON, SE6 2HG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr K Krishnarajah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref is DC/23/132558.
 - The development proposed is part extension to second floor/roof alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.
3. I saw that a development had commenced in the location of the appeal proposal, although it did not reflect the submitted plans including in respect of the location of windows and the eaves of the side elevation. The appellant also refers to discrepancies in the submitted plans regarding the inclusion of windows. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined this appeal on the basis of the submitted plans, albeit with the window arrangement as shown on the revised details within the Grounds of Appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal proposal is located to the rear of a terrace which has commercial uses on the ground floor and other uses, including residential, on the upper floors. The proposed extension would be constructed on a semi-detached pitched roof outrigger to the rear. Despite building work on the appeal site, the form and rhythm of the outrigger on the site and neighbouring properties is still apparent.
6. The evidence suggests that the appeal site previously contained an extension to the roof of the outrigger which projected above its ridge. However, this did

not project as far to the rear as the appeal proposal. In comparison, the proposed extension would project to almost the full length of the roofslope of the outrigger. Due to its degree of projection and flat roofed design, the proposal would appear as a jarring and incongruous addition to the rear of the host building. The box-like form of the extension would be particularly intrusive projecting above the ridge of the outrigger and further to the rear than an extant chimney stack. Although the proposal would not be visible from the public realm, it would be apparent from the rear of nearby properties.

7. The appellant refers to a significant rear extension to 19-21 Brownhill Road. However, I saw that this served to confirm the jarring nature of a flank wall projecting along the length of the outrigger and above the ridge. That said, the sizeable extension at Nos 19-21 is of a more coherent design across the full width of the rear elevation, and is therefore materially different to the clumsy and incremental appearance of the appeal proposal.
8. The appellant refers to comments within the Council's Officer Report on the application at Nos 19-21 regarding the advice of the SPD¹ in respect of the relationship with the main roof. However, even though the appeal proposal would not involve changes to the main roof of the host building, this does not lead me to a different conclusion in respect of the harm arising from the design and arrangement of the proposal based on my own observations.
9. The appellant also refers to other extensions in the area, but it has not been demonstrated that they are a direct parallel to the appeal proposal in respect of the form of the host building and the nature of the extension. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
10. I conclude that, due to its placement and design, the proposed extension would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the area to the rear of the terrace. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy 15 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policies 30 and 31 of the Development Management Local Plan 2014 which together seek to promote high quality design appropriate for its context.
11. Although the SPD does not address the specific circumstances of the extension, the proposal would be contrary to the aims of the SPD in respect of providing a roof form which is appropriate to the building and adjoining properties.

Other Matters

12. The proposal would provide further and improved accommodation at the appeal property. However, the benefits arising from the increase in accommodation and the improvements would be very limited and would not outweigh the harm I have identified in respect of character and appearance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR

¹ Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document, 2019