

## 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: 01 March 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/16/3162783**

**32C Borland Road, Southwark, London SE15 3BD**

- 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 Jason Terry against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
  - The application Ref 16/AP/0870, dated 7 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2016.
  - The development proposed is extension to the rear outrigger through the raising of the eaves height and ridge height; installation of windows, a juliet balcony and rooflights to the proposed extended outrigger.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension to the rear outrigger through the raising of the eaves height and ridge height; installation of windows, a juliet balcony and rooflights to the proposed extended outrigger at 32C Borland Road, Southwark, London SE15 3BD in accordance with the terms of the application ref 16/AP/0870, dated 7 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location and block plan; 8376 - Drwg No. 02 - Rev. A; 8376 - Drwg No. 03 - Rev. A; 8376 - Drwg No. 06 - Rev. C; 8376 - Drwg No. 07 - Rev. C.
  - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no. 8376 - Drwg No. 07 - Rev. C and specified on the application form, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposal varies between the application form and the subsequent documents. I have used the description given on the decision notice as it describes the development more accurately.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
-

## Reasons

4. The appeal site at 32C Borland Road comprises a second floor flat within a corner property which is located in a predominantly residential area. The proposal would add an extension to the roof of the outrigger wing to the east of the site.
5. The Council's document entitled '2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards – Supplementary Planning Document' (SPD, October 2011) sets out guidelines for extensions to residential properties. It recommends that extensions should be subordinate to the original building. Whilst the west elevation of the property matches the height of the adjacent two storey dwelling, the high level fenestration, including a side gable window, a front oculus window and rooflights, indicates that the front section of the building incorporates three floors of accommodation.
6. The existing outrigger roof would be raised by approximately 1.2m, and would join the main roof below its ridge height. The proposed new windows would sit below the level of the existing second floor gable window. These factors would allow the extended outrigger to remain visually subservient to the taller section of the building. Matching materials are proposed, and so the extension would blend to an acceptable degree with the existing building. The proposed new windows would also align with the existing ground and first floor windows below. The development would therefore comply with the relevant advice given in the SPD.
7. The Council is also concerned about the visual impact of the proposed glazing and juliet balcony to the rear gable elevation, facing east along Stuart Street. On my site visit, I observed that there is a variety of building types close to the appeal site, including traditional terraced dwellings, a building of industrial character on the opposite side of Stuart Road, and a more contemporary building further to the east on Stuart Road. Within this context, I noted a wide range of window types in the vicinity, and I do not consider that this further variation in design approach would be unduly harmful or out of place.
8. I accept that many of the older terraced properties in the area are two storeys in height, with two storey outriggers. However, the property at 32 Borland Road is of modern build and design, and larger in scale than many of its neighbours. It thus varies in character from the surrounding dwellings, and whilst the proposal would alter the appearance of the building, I do not consider that the changes would be so visually harmful as to warrant the withholding of planning permission.
9. Drawing these factors together, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would thus comply with Strategic Policy 12 of the Southwark Council Core Strategy (April 2011), which sets out design and conservation requirements, Policy 3.12 of the Southwark Plan (SP, 2007), which seeks quality in design, and LP Policy 3.13, which sets out principles of good urban design. The proposal would further comply with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (LP, March 2015), which relates to development and local character, and LP Policy 7.6, insofar as it requires that design should be appropriate to its context. It would further comply with the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires good design.

### **Conditions**

10. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council, and have made some amendments for clarity. For certainty, it is necessary that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. A condition relating to materials is appropriate in the interests of character and appearance.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons above, and taking all other matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Elaine Gray*

INSPECTOR