



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2025

by H Whitfield BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/25/3373945

First Floor Flat, 112 Brownhill Road, Lewisham, London SE6 2DH

- 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 Rudy Nemor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/140903.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable loft conversion with the erection of an L-shaped dormer on main and outrigger roof and insertion of two roof lights in the front slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a hip-to-gable extension, an L-shaped rear roof extension and the insertion of two roof lights in the front roof slope at First Floor Flat, 112 Brownhill Road, Lewisham, London SE6 2DH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/25/140903, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos Location Plan, Site Location, First Floor (Prop) 2025/429/02 Rev. A, Loft Room Plan 2025/429/03 Rev. A, Section (Prop) 2025/429/05 Rev. A, Rear and Side Elevations 2025/429/06 Rev. A, Front and Side Elevations 2025/429/07 Rev. A, and Roof Plans 2025/429/08 Rev. A.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no. 2025/429/05 Rev. A, 2025/429/06 Rev. A and 2025/429/07 Rev. A.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the address as it appears on the appeal form as this more accurately describes the appeal site. I have also made minor amendments to the description of development in my formal decision to align with that used by the appellant on the appeal form and to omit elements that do not relate to an act of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal building and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwelling that has been sub-divided into flats. The building is located in a predominately residential area, characterised mainly by two-storey semi-detached and terraced properties of a similar style and appearance. While some properties have been extended and altered, there remains a general uniformity and consistency in the street scene. Properties on Brownhill Road are relatively evenly spaced with small gaps between them, restricting achievable views to the rear of properties from the public realm. However, as properties on Brownhill Road back onto Elmer Road, the rear elevations of surrounding properties are intervisible from rear gardens and upper floor windows.
5. The appeal building has a two-storey pitched roof outrigger to the rear which adjoins the same projection on the adjoining property and is reflected on many surrounding properties. This results in a degree of consistency. However, I observed that some properties in the vicinity of the appeal site have carried out rear extensions and roof alterations, including the construction of dormer windows, which results in a more varied character and appearance to the rear.
6. The appeal scheme proposes alterations to the main roof of the dwelling which would change the hipped roof to a gable and the installation of rooflights in the front roof slope. As there are examples of similar developments in the surrounding area the Council raises no concerns with these elements of the scheme. Based on the evidence before me, I see no reason to come to a different conclusion. The crux of the Council's case therefore relates to the rear L-shaped dormer roof extension which would extend the main roof slope of the dwelling and the two-storey rear outrigger.
7. On the main roof slope, the dormer would be inset from the side roof plane, set marginally down from the ridge and away from the eaves. The extension over the outrigger would also project less than half the depth of the two-storey range and would be inset slightly from the eaves. Both would be clad in tiles to match the existing roof. The roof extension would be large; however, it would not project for a significant depth of the rear outrigger and has been inset from the ridge and eaves of the parts of the property it would adjoin. As such, the design would respect the proportions of the appeal building and generally follows the guidance contained within section 5.11.2 of the Lewisham Local Plan Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (the SPD).
8. Due to its elevated nature and proximity to surrounding properties, the dormer extension would be visible from surrounding residences, glimpsed views may also be achievable between properties from Elmer Road. However, this would not be dissimilar to other examples of roof extensions and flat roof dormers in the immediate area. Irrespective of whether these were constructed with express or deemed planning permission, these local examples all contribute to the varied character and appearance of the rear elevations of surrounding properties. Moreover, any views would be of an extension constructed to respect the proportions and appearance of the property such that it would not be incongruous or visually intrusive.
9. I note the general resistance to L-shaped roof extensions in the SPD and the advice that such extensions should demonstrate exceptional architectural quality. However, this is design guidance and does not seek to resist such development exclusively. In this instance, due to the proposed scale and design, the location of the appeal site, the character of the surrounding area and the existence of other rear roof additions to

surrounding properties, the development would not be contrary to the overall aim of the SPD which seeks to deliver high quality development that responds appropriately to its context.

10. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the appeal building or surrounding area. This complies with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy QD9 of the Lewisham Local Plan (2025) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Which, together and amongst other things, seek high quality developments that respond appropriately to a sites context and character to achieve well-designed places.

Other Matters

11. Interested parties have raised concerns about the potential for noise and disturbance during construction activities and the effect on their living conditions. However, the construction period and any associated disturbance would be for a finite period such that it would not amount to unacceptable harm on the living conditions of surrounding occupiers. Moreover, there is no substantive evidence that the construction of the development would result in a risk to pedestrian safety.
12. Concerns have also been raised about the effects on the privacy of the ground floor flat and the potential reduction in light in the garden. However, the additional windows proposed to the rear would have no greater effect on the privacy of surrounding occupiers than other upper floor windows on neighbouring properties. As the height of the extension would be below the main ridge height of the dwelling, there would be no adverse effect on light to the rear garden either, noting this faces broadly south.
13. I note concerns relating to the creation of an additional residential unit and absence of any parking at the property. However, the appeal scheme does not propose the creation of an additional residential unit. There is no substantive evidence that the appeal scheme would result in any adverse impact on the structural integrity of the building or its utilities, including water supply, either. Any matters relating to permission from the freeholder of the building also fall outside of my jurisdiction in the determination of this appeal and have not influenced my decision.

Conditions

14. I have considered the planning conditions suggested by the Council against the tests in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. Where appropriate, I have adjusted the wording of the conditions to improve precision.
15. I have imposed conditions specifying the period for commencement and requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interest of planning certainty. A condition is also imposed requiring compliance with the materials on the approved plans to ensure that the development has an appropriate visual appearance.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal scheme accords with the development plan and the appeal should be allowed.

H Whitfield INSPECTOR