



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2019

by David Storrie DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/19/3221524
73 Glenfarg Road, London SE6 1XN

- 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 Xiong Bing He against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/18/109512, dated 30 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is for the alteration of existing roof height of house by 100mm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey, end of terrace property in a street of similar terraced properties laid out in tight knit blocks. The road is quite long and straight and rises up from east to west where the roof line of the terraces generally steps up as the street rises. This, along with a generally uniform design at the front of the properties provide a sense of rhythm and uniformity. The area is residential in character.
4. From my site visit, it was evident that the proposed development had been completed. It was also noted that, not only had the ridge height been increased, but the roof pitch was also different to the pitch of neighbouring properties. Presumably this was to accommodate the increase in the height of the ridge but, given that the appeal property is an end terrace, this change amplifies the visual impact of the increased ridge height.
5. There is a dispute between the parties as to whether the increase in ridge height is 100mm or 200mm. Based upon what the appellant has applied for I consider it as a 100mm increase. This increase in height is noticeable for the reasons I have set out above. It disrupts the rhythm and uniform appearance of the roof line along the road and as a consequence is harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider streetscene.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of properties in the road where the ridge line has been raised and hip to gable changes have been made. Whilst I viewed these on my site visit, none were entirely comparable to the appeal site. I have been provided with no planning history on these properties save for the Council informing that the increase in the roof height of 71 Glenfarg Road was carried out without planning permission but that this occurred over four years ago. That said, I found their impact to be harmful to the rhythm and continuity of design that I have identified in the street. These examples were in the minority in the street such that the strong character that I have identified is not eroded unduly. Notwithstanding this, I must consider the appeal proposal on its own individual merits.
7. Taking the above into account, I conclude that the development harms the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It therefore does not accord with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (2015), Policy 15 of the Council's Core Strategy (2011), DM Policy 30 and DM Policy 31 of the Council's Development Management Local Plan (2014). These policies require, amongst other things, that extensions to existing buildings should respect the form, setting, period and architectural detailing of the original building.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

David Storrie

INSPECTOR