
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2018

by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27th April 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/W/17/3181775
338 Ivydale Road, London SE15 3DG

- 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 & Mrs Saunders against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 17/AP/1915, dated 15 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is an L-shaped roof extension to create an additional bedroom and bathroom at loft level. The proposal is also looking to introduce four new rooflights; two to the front of the property, one over the new stairwell area and one over the new bathroom area and extend the front slope of the roof so that there is an acceptable height created at the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a L-shaped roof extension; raising of the ridge level by 390mm and the installation of two rooflights to front roofslope at 338 Ivydale Road, London SE15 3DG in accordance with the terms of the application, 17/AP/1915, dated 15 May 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: L01, S02 rev A, D01 rev A, D02 rev B, P01 rev A and P02 rev B.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr & Mrs Saunders against the Council of the London Borough of Southwark. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural matter

3. The Council have described the proposed development as the 'construction of a L-shaped roof extension; raise the ridge level by 390mm and install two rooflights to front roofslope'. It is noted that the Appellant has also utilised this description on the appeal form. Given that this description accurately reflects the proposed development, I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on the north side of Ivydale Road which is characterised by terraced properties which are two storeys in scale. The proposal includes the raising of the ridge line of the property by approximately 0.39 metres and would also include an extended parapet wall. A split level 'L' shaped dormer is proposed at the rear.
6. Whilst I acknowledge that there is a degree of uniformity in this section of the road with respect to the ridge lines of the terraced properties, there would be limited views of the roofline along Ivydale Road from both directions. The ridgeline would be set further back (from the street) than the ridgelines of the neighbouring properties and this, together with the parapet wall/chimney, would mean that the increased height would not be readily noticeable. To that extent, the proposal would still be subservient to the host property.
7. In coming to that view I acknowledge that views of the raised ridgeline would be possible when looking from Fernholme Road. However, the dominant chimney stacks, parapet walls and the gable feature to the front of the property would draw the eye away from the raised roofline and as such it would not appear as incongruous feature in the streetscene. It is also significant that, in addition to the other developments which have been brought to my attention, I saw that 356 Ivydale Road also has had works to its roof which has raised the ridgeline of that property.
8. In respect of the rear dormer and the rooflights to the front roofslope, the Council do not appear to have raised any specific objections to these elements of the scheme. Given their design and appearance, I consider that they would not give rise to any harm to the character and appearance of the area.
9. Taking the proposal as a whole, for the above reasons the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would accord with Policies 3.12 and 3.13 of the Southwark Plan (2007) and the Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2011) which amongst other matters seek to ensure that development achieves a high quality of design that is appropriate to its local context.

Conditions

10. The Council has not provided a list of suggested conditions. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the reason of certainty.

Conclusion

11. Taking all matters into consideration, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR