



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 15 June 2021

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/W/20/3263076

23A Ballina Street, Crofton Park, London SE23 1DR

- 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 Appan Pathmanathan against the decision of London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/20/117261, dated 26 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is alterations to a roof to create a loft conversion using an 'L' shaped dormer with two roof lights to the front slope, to provide additional residential accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the Council refused planning permission the London Plan 2021 (LP) has been adopted. The Council has confirmed that the adopted LP Policy that it relies on is D3. Both the appellant and the Council have been given the opportunity to make further comments on the change to planning policy that has occurred.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The roof on which the proposed dormer would be sited is located to the rear of the building. The properties in this area are terraced and form perimeter blocks along Ballina Street, Lessing Street and Gabriel Street. This means that the roof does not have any significant visual presence when viewed from the public domain. However, the roof is clearly visible from adjacent dwellings and their rear garden areas.
5. The proposed L shaped dormer would sit on the main roof plane and that of the adjoining outrigger. It would almost entirely cover the main roof plane and it would further cover much of that of the outrigger. By reason of its bulk, its size and its absence of any substantial setback from the eaves, it would form a dominant and incongruous feature that would fail to be subservient to the host property. Consequently, it would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of both the host property itself and the surrounding area.

6. Section 5.11 of the Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD) states that only in exceptional circumstances will L-shaped roof extensions be acceptable, for instance where they are common within the immediate context. Furthermore, such extensions should not overly dominate the original dwelling. For the reasons I have outlined, the proposal would overly dominate the original property. Whilst there are existing dormer windows on properties close to the appeal site, there appears to only be one which is L shaped and comparable to the appeal proposal. They are, therefore, not common within the immediate context.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore fail to accord with Policy D3 of the LP, Policy 15 of the Core Strategy 2011 and DM Policies 30 and 31 of the Development Management Local Plan 2014, where they seek to safeguard character and appearance. There would also be a conflict with the SPD which sets out how L shaped roof extensions should be considered and with the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to achieve well-designed places.

Other Matters

8. There would be employment generated during the construction period however given the relatively small scale of the proposal this would only be limited, and it does not outweigh the harm that I have found to character and appearance.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR