



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2025 by R Higgins

Decision by T Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/D/25/3375089

47 Ridgewell Close, Lewisham, London SE26 5AP

- 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 Frederik and Davy-Grace Raynaud against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/140785.
 - The development proposed is for construction of a ground floor wraparound side/rear extension, front porch, side loft extensions and all associated works at 47 Ridgewell Close, SE26.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development as detailed on the application form has been amended in subsequent documents. I have adopted the description used in the Council's decision notice, which reflects accurately and concisely the proposal before me.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The host dwelling is a two-storey end-of-terrace property situated on a prominent corner plot within a predominantly residential area. Although the surrounding area does not exhibit a clearly defined building line, the streetscape is characterised by a degree of visual cohesion, this is achieved through consistent external materials, most notably the widespread use of buff brickwork beneath tiled roofs. The street is largely devoid of loft conversions or dormer additions, contributing to its uncluttered appearance. Overall, the locality benefits from a spacious and open character.
6. The proposed dormer additions would span much of the roof and would be highly visible from the public realm. As they are not set down from the ridgeline, they fail to read as subordinate elements and instead sit uncomfortably against the main roof form. Their overall scale and massing would prevent any meaningful sense of

subservience. The proposed development would result in two substantial structures that together would visually dominate the dwelling and create a top-heavy, bulky appearance.

7. This top-heavy appearance would form an incongruous addition that would disrupt the otherwise coherent and largely uniform character of the surrounding area, where roof alterations are limited. The intrusive nature of the proposal is particularly apparent in the L-shaped dormer on the right elevation. Its awkward configuration and dominating relationship with the neighbouring roof make it seem placed into a space that is fundamentally unsuitable for an extension of this scale, drawing attention to its excessive bulk and poor integration with the host property.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to previous approvals, by the Council and at appeal, on the site for a dormer window. These were for a single dormer window and are therefore not comparable to the development in front of me. Nevertheless, these would be less harmful than the appeal proposal as they relate to a single dormer and would not result in such a domineering and top-heavy appearance as the proposed development. With regards to the nearby certificate of lawfulness, this was granted in 2007 and has not been constructed. In any event, I do not have full details, such as width, of those dormer windows to conclude that they are comparable with the development in front of me.
9. The appellant refers to a functional need for the additional accommodation. Whilst the proposal would provide additional floorspace, I am not convinced that this would be the only way of increasing floorspace, and the previous permission would provide additional accommodation in a less harmful form of development.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Consequently, it would be contrary Policy QD9 of the Lewisham Local Plan (2025), the guidance contained within the Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2019) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021). These, amongst other things, collectively seek to ensure new development is well integrated, subordinate and respects the form and proportion of the existing building. It would also not comply with paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that developments that are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Higgins

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

T Law

INSPECTOR