

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 25 January 2017

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3rd March 2017

Appeal A: APP/A5840/W/16/3159790 143, Peckham Rye, London SE15 3UL

- 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 Susanna Blaine against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 16/AP/2515, dated 20 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is roof extension and conversion from single dwelling to house with separate lower ground floor flat with extension.
-

Appeal B: APP/A5840/Y/16/3159791 143, Peckham Rye, London SE15 3UL

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Susanna Blaine against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 16/AP/2516, dated 20 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2016.
 - The works proposed are roof extension and conversion from single dwelling to house with separate lower ground floor flat with extension.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A: The appeal is dismissed.
2. Appeal B: The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council advises that the use of the building as a dwelling, following its conversion from a day nursery, is unauthorised. In addition there is no planning history relating to a lower ground floor rear extension and other alterations. I have taken this into consideration in my determination of the appeal.
 4. As some elements of the proposal are acceptable, I have considered issuing a split decision. However, I am not convinced that the various components are functionally and physically severable. Consequently the proposal has been determined as a whole.
-

Main Issues

5. The main issue in this case is whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of this Grade II listed building.

Reasons

6. No 143 is one of a terrace of 7 houses, No's 141-153 (odd), which is a Grade II listed building dating from 1827. Each property in the terrace has three storeys and a basement and is built as part of a pair, with 2 main bays each and a lower, recessed, entrance bay. This recess ensures that the pairs of properties are clearly legible.
7. The terrace has been extensively altered since its original construction, particularly at roof level, following damage during the Second World War. The appeal property and the other half of the pair, no 145, have V shaped roofs; that at No 145 is concealed by a straight parapet at the front, that at No 143, by an unusual V shaped parapet. Other properties in the terrace, No's 147-153, and No 141, have dormered slate mansard roofs.
8. The building has been in residential use for some time and the proposal seeks to convert it from a single dwelling to a house with a self-contained basement flat. The proposal includes the erection of a mansard roof extension to form a third floor; a mansard roof at second floor level; a single storey rear extension at lower ground level and internal alterations including the subdivision of rooms and removal of a pier connection also at lower ground level.
9. The starting point for the consideration of the proposals is Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) which require that special regard is had to the desirability of preserving the building, or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses. The significance of the listed building lies in both its architectural and its historic interest. Although it has been altered and its uniformity affected, it retains much of its historic fabric and detailing. The appeal property makes a positive contribution to the significance of the terrace as a whole. Its damage in the Second World War and its subsequent partial rebuilding add to its historic interest.
10. There is no evidence of the roof form of the original terrace. At the time it was constructed, common roof types included both mansard and central valley roofs; the later generally concealed with a parapet at the front but left exposed at the rear. My attention has been drawn to evidence that the existing roof structure is not original. Nevertheless, its V shaped form has existed for some considerable time and was apparent when the building was listed in 1972. As both parts of the pair have such a roof form, it makes a significant contribution to the architectural and historic interest of the listed building.
11. The proposal would see the replacement of the V shaped roof form with a mansard roof incorporating dormer windows to the front and rear. I acknowledge that other mansard roofs exist in the terrace, albeit that these may not be original features. Nevertheless, the addition of a mansard would result in the loss of the present roof form, which contributes positively to the building's significance. In addition, the proposed mansard would increase the height and presence of No 143 and make it more dominant, thereby unbalancing the appearance of this property and No 145 as a pair.

12. I acknowledge that it is likely that the terrace was designed as a coherent entity with a regularity and rhythm to its detailing. Nevertheless it has been altered in a piecemeal manner and now lacks that coherence. Any benefit from adding a further mansard to the terrace would be outweighed by the harm as set out above. I understand that the mansard roof at No 141 was granted permission in 2009. The Council advises that at the time the building had been derelict and was at risk. Moreover there was already a mansard roof extension at the adjoining half of the pair No 139. The context for that approval is therefore different from that of the appeal site.
13. I have taken into consideration the appellant's point that the V shaped parapet is not architecturally authentic. Nevertheless it seems to me to add some interest to the building. I acknowledge however, that the proposed straight parapet in itself would not be inappropriate and would match that of the adjoining property.
14. The Council has raised no objections to the construction of a mansard roof at the lower, second floor, level and given the presence of others in the terrace, including at adjoining properties I have no reason to disagree.
15. The proposed rear extension at lower ground level would replace a smaller, modern extension which has no intrinsic architectural merit. The proposed extension would have a flat roof concealed by a parapet, with a central glazed lantern light, and would extend across the width of the main part of the dwelling.
16. The extension would be set at a low level and would be subservient to the listed building in terms of its scale. However, the 'conservatory' style of the extension, in particular its window proportions and complex detailing, would neither respect nor successfully contrast with that of the rear elevation of the building which has a simple, robust appearance. In addition, the proposal seeks to open up the space between the rear room of the building and the extension by the removal of a structural pier and double doors. This would mean the loss of some historic fabric which, notwithstanding the planning status of the existing alterations, enables the original two-room plan form to be read. Whilst I recognise that some internal features have been lost, this in itself does not justify further harm.
17. Other proposed alterations to the plan form, including the subdivision of rooms and the enclosure of the staircase at lower ground level would be reversible and would not therefore cause undue harm to the character or interest of the building.
18. However, for the reasons set out, the proposal as a whole would result in harm to the significance of the listed building, although as the alterations would affect only parts of the building, that harm would be less than substantial. The National Planning Policy Framework, which emphasises the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, advises that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including securing its optimum viable use.
19. The proposal would provide an additional unit of accommodation. Whilst this is a benefit of the scheme, it represents a very limited increase in the provision of

housing in the Borough and therefore attracts limited weight in favour of the scheme. In addition, the proposal seeks to restore original features, including railings and a front door and fanlight although there is no reason why much the same benefit would not be secured from a scheme that caused no harm to the special interest, or significance, of the listed building. Any benefit that may be gained from the alteration of the parapet does not outweigh the harm to the roof form I have identified.

20. Consequently, when considered together, the benefits of the scheme before me are not sufficient to outweigh the harm it would cause; harm that given the requirements of the Act must attract considerable importance and weight on the negative side of the balance.

Conclusion

21. For these reasons, and taking into account all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR