
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2019

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/19/3224648

31 Crewys Road, London SE15 2BJ

- 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 Mrs T Barnes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 18/AP/3455, dated 24 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2018.
 - The development is described on the application form as 'L-Shaped loft conversion over house and existing rear outrigger, including raising roof ridge by 430mm (maintaining existing front roof pitch)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the above description, I note the proposal also includes a Juliette balcony and two rooflights and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a terraced dwelling set within a residential street with a ridge height that is consistent with that of the adjoining properties. There are some very subtle steps in ridge level within the terrace including that between 33 and 35 Crewys Road, but these steps are very few and appear to be original, possibly to allow for slight changes in land levels. The change in levels is also apparent from changes in window head, sill and eaves heights. The terrace within which the appeal property sits and the general uniformity of ridge heights contributes to an attractive and cohesive street scene.
5. An increase in ridge height is proposed to facilitate the proposed L-shaped loft conversion and this is the main area of disagreement between the main parties. Although the raised ridgeline would be set back from that existing, it would give the property an overly bulky and prominent appearance within the street scene and would appear at considerable odds with the prevailing

consistency of ridge lines of groups of dwellings along the road. Moreover, the increase in ridge height would be materially greater than the step up between No 33 and No 35. I do not consider that the party wall parapet nor the chimney stack between the host property and No 29 would offer sufficient screening to mitigate the harm.

6. Consequently, the proposal would be discordant with and significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to saved Policy 3.12 of The Southwark Plan 2007 and Strategic Policy 12 of the Southwark Council Core Strategy 2011 which seek high quality design that enhances the quality of the built environment.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to other examples of increases in ridge lines in support of the scheme. However, none of these examples are on Crewys Road and therefore do not share the same context. I therefore afford these examples little weight and they do not justify a planning permission in this instance. In any event, each case should be considered on its own merits.
8. The appellant has suggested that they would need to relocate should the appeal not be successful. However, no details of the personal circumstances which may necessitate such an outcome have been drawn to my attention and therefore I afford this matter limited weight. Furthermore, any benefit of increased space would be a personal one for the appellant and would not, in my view, outweigh the substantial harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the area which is experienced by many.
9. Whilst I note there were no objections from neighbours, this does not inevitably indicate an absence of harm. The Council clearly sets out why it considers the application unacceptable and as can be seen from my above findings, I concur with this view.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR