



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2025

by A Knight BA PG Dip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/25/3374674

Flat 4, 295 Brownhill Road, Lewisham, London SE6 1AG

- 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 Nella of Nella Properties Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/141046.
 - The development proposed is construction of rear extension at first floor level, extension of roof, two rear dormers, installation of two rooflights to the front roofslope and associated changes at Flat 4, 295 Brownhill Road, SE6.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site includes a residential building (the building) located on the corner of Brownhill Road and Torridon Road. It is reasonably attractive, with some pleasing and ornate detailing, red brick walls, and a tiled roof. A number of surrounding properties display the same or very similar materials, details, floorplan, and roof form as the building, creating a notable and attractive pocket of architectural uniformity that appears to have endured for over a century.
 4. As set out in the Planning Practice Guidance, non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs) may be identified through processes such as local and neighbourhood plan-making though, in some cases, they may also be identified as part of the decision-making process on planning applications. The building is not nationally or locally listed but has been identified as an NDHA by the Council. I find that its significance lies in the residual quality of its detailing and in its contribution to longstanding local uniformity.
 5. It is proposed to extend the building at first floor and roof levels, effectively infilling an existing recess. The roof would be extended, and two dormers added to the rear elevation.
 6. The corner position of the building is such that its side and upper rear elevations are directly visible and reasonably prominent from the public highway. The proposed extensions would be erected at the part of the building closest to, and most directly visible from, the public sphere.
-

7. The gap between the building and the rear boundary of the site is sufficient for the upper rear elevations of neighbouring properties along Brownhill Road to be directly visible from Torridon Road, and for the strong degree of architectural uniformity across Numbers 295 to 289 to be readily appreciable.
8. As it involves directly continuing both the side and rearmost walls and the side and rear roof planes, the proposed extensions would be neither visually subordinate to, nor readily distinguishable from, the existing building. Indeed, the original form of the building would largely be lost. As a result, the development would harmfully undermine the contribution the building makes to, and the benefits it draws from, local uniformity. This would be exacerbated by the high level of visual prominence the extensions would have in the public sphere, by their appearance against the backdrop of largely uniform buildings up to No 289, and by the proposed dormers, which are not a feature of Numbers 295 to 289 and so incongruous in that respect.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to nearby developments they consider to be comparable. Insofar as consistency of decision-making is concerned, however, I have been provided with very little evidence that any of the cited examples ever shared the same degree of uniformity with their neighbours as the appeal site building does. Moreover, I have little reason to feel that the cited examples were approved against the same or similar planning policies as are in effect today; Indeed, the only evidence I have on that front indicates that the decision to allow works at 311 Brownhill Road was taken some 18 years ago. For these reasons I attach little weight to the cited examples.
10. The proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area, including NDHAs, contrary to Policy HE3 of the Lewisham Local Plan (2025) which requires development to preserve or enhance the significance of NDHA's and their setting.

Other Matters

11. The appeal proposal is a revised design following previous unsuccessful applications. I recognise that it marks an attempt to overcome previous reasons for refusal but must determine the appeal on the merits of the proposal before me.
12. The decision notice refers to Policy QD7 of the Local Plan, but I have been provided with little evidence of conflict with that policy.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
14. The appeal is dismissed.

A Knight

INSPECTOR