



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2024 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/24/3347066

51 Ryedale, Southwark, London SE22 0QL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by [REDACTED] against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref is 24/AP/0228.
 - The development proposed is raised ridge rear dormer loft conversion with velux windows to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for raised ridge rear dormer loft conversion with velux windows to front roof slope at 51 Ryedale, London SE22 0QL, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/AP/0228, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 02 (Proposed First Floor Plan & Proposed Loft Floor Plan), 03 (Proposed Roof Plan), 04 (Proposed Section A-A), 06 (Proposed Elevations) and the 1:1250 Site Location Plan 'Produced 30 January 2024'.
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. 51 Ryedale (No 51) is a mid-terraced property situated within a residential area. It sits within a terrace which has a cohesive appearance due in part to its stepped roofline and its repeated features including similar bay windows, recessed porches and brick/render elevations. However, there is variation to the design of other groups of terraced dwellings across the wider street scene.

On my site visit I saw that many of the dwellings on Ryedale and on the surrounding streets have roof alterations. This includes numerous examples of roof ridge height increases, as well as dormer windows. The appeal site is therefore viewed within a context comprising a mix of dwelling types and roof styles, alongside other alterations and extensions which add to the variety of the area.

5. The increase in ridge height would be modest and the angle of the roof slope would not change. When viewed along Ryedale from the direction of Underhill Road, the relationship of the proposal with the roofline of the wider terrace would be largely screened by the chimney between No 51 and No 53 Ryedale. The extension would be more noticeable along Ryedale from the direction of Forest Hill Road. However, the ridge of No 51 is already stepped up compared to No 49 Ryedale. In this regard, the characteristic stepped roofline of the terrace would be retained albeit with a slightly increased step in height between No 51 and No 49.
6. Part of the dormer window would be visible from the street on Ryedale, although due its location on the rear roof slope it would not be highly prominent. Furthermore, on my site visit I saw many dormer windows on both the front and rear roof slopes close to the appeal dwelling and so the dormer would not be unusual in this context. When I viewed the site from the cemetery, it was only once I left the established paths within the cemetery that the site become more visible. Even then the extension would not appear incongruous amongst the rear elevations of the surrounding residential buildings, and it would not be overly noticeable from any significant public vantage points.
7. Therefore, even though, the roof extension would be above the height of the ridge of the main roof of the host dwelling and so would not follow the guidance in the '2015 Update to the Residential Design Standards (2011) Supplementary Planning Document', this would not be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the terrace or the wider street scene in this particular instance.
8. I conclude, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore comply with the design and character and appearance requirements of Policy D4 (Delivering Good Design) of The London Plan (2021) and Policies P13 (Design of Places), P14 (Design Quality) and P15 (Residential Design) of The Southwark Plan (2022), which include that development is a high standard of design which responds positively to the existing townscape, character and context.
9. For the same reasons, the proposal would also comply with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which amongst other things states that development should be sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

10. Any potential for the proposal to affect neighbouring properties including in terms of ensuring neighbouring roofs are watertight, any implications for neighbouring guttering and party wall agreements are private matters outside of the planning considerations for this appeal. There is no objective evidence before me to suggest that hours of work relating to the construction of the

proposal would be excessive or likely to have a material effect on neighbouring living conditions. In the event that they were, that would be a separate matter for the Council to investigate.

Conditions

11. I have included time limit and approved plans conditions in the interests of certainty and clarity. I have included a condition requiring that materials match those of the host dwelling in the interests of ensuring that the development has a composite appearance and positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed since it would comply with the development plan.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR