



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/23/3329061

78 Howson Road, Crofton Park, London SE4 2AU

- 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 Nico Celaj against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/23/131247, dated 22 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as a dormer extension to the roof at rear and an over offshoot with 2No rooflights to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The works described in the banner heading above have been carried out. This appeal therefore relates to a retrospective planning application.
3. The appellant's written submissions refer to various amendments to the appeal scheme that could be carried out. These changes are not shown on the drawings before me. Where suggested changes are minor, and could therefore be secured via planning conditions, I have taken these matters into account.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the appeal scheme on the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property forms part of a terrace of handsome 2-storey Victorian houses with pitched roofs and prominent bay windows at the front. It is situated in a largely residential street comprising terraces of similar age and appearance, which form a pleasant residential environment. The houses in the terrace to either side of the appeal property feature 2-storey outriggers at the rear and retain their original roof forms.
6. The appeal scheme primarily comprises the erection of an L-shaped roof extension above the rear half of the main roof and a large proportion of the outrigger. These elements have flat roofs and are clad in tiles with UPVC windows facing the rear garden. The rear elevation of the addition to the main

- roof is flush with the original rear elevation. To accommodate this addition the main roof ridge has been raised and the angle of the front roof slope increased.
7. In the context of a terrace that retains its original roof form, the boxy and flat-roofed appeal scheme is a jarring, overly prominent and incongruous addition when viewed from the gardens to the rear. At the front the raised ridge and adjusted roof pitch are evident from the street and disrupt the unity of the terrace, which I note is replicated to a large degree by other terraces in the street.
 8. The appellant has referred to a small number of houses in the area that feature raised ridges. It is not evident to me that these were lawful when built or, if so, whether consent was gained under current development plan policy. Examples of rear roof extensions and dormers have also been presented which I note may have accorded with permitted development rights. I also note there are a number of infill houses in the area that provide some degree of variety in the street scene. Each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits having due regard to its particular form and context and current planning policy. As such I attribute limited weight to the examples of roof level development in the area.
 9. In conclusion, due to its height, bulk, siting and design the appeal scheme has an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the terrace and the street scene. It therefore fails to accord with Policy 15 of the Lewisham Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM30 and DM31 of the Lewisham Development Management Local Plan (2014). Amongst other matters these policies seek to ensure that developments are of a high standard of design and integrate with the local area. The proposal also conflicts with the aims of Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and the Council's Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019). I note that section 5.11 of the latter very clearly advises that L-shaped roof extensions may only be acceptable in exceptional circumstances, "for instance where they are common within the immediate context".

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR