

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2017

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 01 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/17/3180868
36 Crystal Palace Road, London, SE22 9HB

- 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 Stuart Martin against the decision of The Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 17/AP/1735 dated 4 May 2017 was refused by notice dated 30 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a domestic roof conversion to form additional bedroom and ensuite bathroom.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end-terrace three-storey house including its basement. It is situated on Crystal Palace Road, which in the vicinity of the site, contains a variety of two and three storey buildings which have butterfly style roofs behind front parapet walls. Whilst there have been alterations and extensions to some properties, the generally consistent roof lines and parapet walls, along with other regular architectural styling amongst groups of properties, contribute to the character and appearance of the area.
 4. The proposal seeks permission for a flat roof extension that would extend across most of the width of the property. Whilst I note the proposal has been carefully designed in a contemporary style, the roof extension would result in an increase in the height of the roof by around 1.6m. This would disrupt the rhythm of the terrace where there is a strong repetitive pattern of butterfly roofs, and appear visually intrusive on the western side of Crystal Palace Road. I do not agree that it would appear well proportioned, even when considering the setback of the proposal.
 5. I was able to see at the time of my visit that there were different forms of roof along the length of Crystal Palace Road and in the wider surrounding area,
-

some of which have been extended. As the appellant however acknowledges, the northern end of Crystal Palace Road does have runs of butterfly roofs, which on the western side, remain intact. Although these are not visible from street level, the flat roof, box-like form of the extension would interrupt the consistent front parapet roofline.

6. My attention has been drawn to a variety of other roof extensions and reference has also been made to precedent and consistency in decision-making. Whilst I was able to see these roof extensions, including the referenced examples on the eastern side of Crystal Palace Road, I am not aware of the full circumstances of these cases and in any event, I am required to determine this appeal on its own merits.
7. As such, I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the area. This would be contrary to Strategic Policy 12 of the Council's Core Strategy, Saved Policy 3.12 of The Southwark Plan and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, the highest possible standards of design. The development would not therefore make a positive contribution in regenerating an area. It would also conflict with the Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document which require extensions to harmonise with the original building and the character of an area and Chapter 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge the appellant is seeking to provide additional accommodation which they consider to be valuable given that one of three bedrooms at the property is small. Although this matter weighs in favour of the development, it does not outweigh the harm I have identified in respect of the main issue.
9. Whilst I agree there should be evolution and innovative flair in development to enable places to change over time, it is also necessary to promote local distinctiveness, which this proposal fails to do for the reasons set out.
10. The proposal would not unacceptably affect the living conditions of neighbours and other aspects of the site such as the garden would remain changed. These are however neutral considerations and not benefits of the proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having considered all other matters raised, including the site not being a listed building or within a Conservation Area, no objections and potentially some support from local neighbours, and reference to a similar mirrored proposal at No. 34, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR