
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2017

by Elaine Gray MA(Hons) MSc IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/16/3158392

11 Stanton House, 620 Rotherhithe Road, London SE16 5DJ

- 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 D Van Den Heever against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 16/AP/1448, dated 20 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey rooftop infill extension to provide additional residential living space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and whether or not the proposal would compromise the development potential of a neighbouring site.

Reasons

Development potential

3. The appeal site is a dwelling which forms part of the larger development at Stanton House. The proposal would create an extension to the property at 11 Stanton House which would sit directly above the neighbouring dwelling at 26 Stanton House.
 4. Policy 3.11 of the Southwark Plan (SP, 2007) requires that all developments should ensure that they maximise the efficient use of land, whilst ensuring that the proposal does not unreasonably compromise the development potential of neighbouring sites. By extending on to the roof of No 26, the proposal would remove any possibility of an upwards extension at that property. I observed on my site visit that opportunities for No 26 to extend sideways would be somewhat limited. I therefore conclude that, by unreasonably compromising the development potential of the property at No 26, the proposal would unacceptably fail to comply with SP Policy 3.11.
 5. I have had regard to the personal circumstances of the appellant and their requirement for additional living accommodation. However, I can give this circumstance little weight in planning terms. Whilst the proposal would
-

undoubtedly provide a satisfactory family home, this would not outweigh its lack of compliance with SP Policy 3.11.

6. I have taken into account the issues surrounding the ownership of the space in question above No 26. However, this is a private matter for relevant parties, and has not had a bearing on my consideration of the appeal scheme.

Character and appearance

7. The Council is also concerned about the appearance of the proposal in relation to the dwelling at No 11. However, when viewing the building externally, it is difficult to discern the size and configuration of the units within. It would therefore not be apparent from the outside that the proposal would be adding any significant additional bulk to the existing property at No 11. The Council otherwise states that the new extension would create a more uniform appearance, and would not appear too large in scale, and I agree with that position. The extension would keep in with the existing corner section of Stanton House in terms of design, dimensions and materials, and would remain in proportion to the existing building as a whole.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of Stanton House, and thus of the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Strategic Policy 12 of the Southwark Council Core Strategy (April 2011), which sets out design and conservation requirements, LP Policy 3.12, which seeks quality in design, and Policy 7.6 of the London Plan (March 2015), insofar as it requires that design should be appropriate to its context.

Conclusion

9. Despite the fact that the development would not harm the character or appearance of the area, it would unacceptably compromise the potential for future development at a neighbouring property. Taking all other matters into consideration, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Gray

INSPECTOR