



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2017

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

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

Decision date: 14th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/17/3167300

256 Turney Road, London, SE21 7JP.

- 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 and Mrs Matt & Alex Mirfield against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 16/AP/3809, dated 16 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as the demolition of the existing dormer to the loft and construction of new dormer and outrigger dormer which will contain a bedroom, shower room and 1 no. new rooflight.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace of which it is part, and thereby whether it would serve to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Dulwich Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, 256 Turney Road, is the last house in a short terrace of four identically designed two-storey dwellings. It is located on the corner of Turney Road and Aysgarth Road, in the Dulwich Village Conservation Area. The property has previously been altered by the construction of a large utilitarian flat roof dormer, built across most of the rear roof slope, and a modest well-mannered single storey rear addition to the original outrigger.
4. The appellants propose the removal of the existing large dormer and the construction of a new smaller dormer to the rear roof slope, along with a new dormer, with rooflight, built partially in the rear roof slope but mainly in the roof slope of the outrigger facing Aysgarth Road.
5. The Council found the removal of the existing dormer and its replacement with a smaller dormer acceptable in principle. From my observations, on the occasion of my site visit, I would agree that the removal of the existing rather unattractive utilitarian dormer is to be welcomed and the new smaller dormer

would have significantly less visual impact on the host property. Accordingly I find no reason to reach a contrary view.

6. However, the formation of the new dormer to the roof of the outrigger would significantly alter the roof form of the original dwelling house and, thereby, the terrace of which it is part. Further, as I saw, the roof of the outrigger is open to public view from Aysgarth Road. Therefore the new dormer, despite its relatively limited height, which would be below the party wall to number 258, would nevertheless be prominent in the street scene.
7. The replacement of the existing rear dormer would enhance both the appearance of the host property and the character and appearance of the conservation area. However, in my judgement, on balance, this enhancement would not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the architectural integrity of number 256 and the terrace that would result from the construction of a new dormer in the roof of the outrigger as proposed. Accordingly, given the property's prominent location, the proposal would not serve to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Dulwich Village Conservation Area.
8. As identified by the appellants, a number of properties in Turney Road have similar side dormer extensions to their outriggers but, as I saw, these are to be found in a group of houses some distance from the appeal site. Further, to my mind, none are as visually prominent as that proposed here would be. In any case, given the harm that I have identified, the existence of other similar dormers on nearby properties is not an appropriate justification for permitting another here.
9. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, which include conservation areas. It draws a distinction between substantial harm and less than substantial harm to such an asset. For the latter, which applies here, the test is that the harm should be weighed against public benefits, including securing the optimum viable use.
10. The proposed development, in terms of its construction, would provide some limited economic benefit. However, given the harm that has been identified I conclude that the public benefits would not outweigh that harm, or the conflict that the development would have with the objectives of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Framework, Policies 7.4 and 7.8 of the London Plan (March 2015), Strategic Policy 12 of *Revitalise*, Southwark's Core Strategy (April 2011), and saved Policies 3.12, 3.13 and 3.16 of The Southwark Plan (2007) as they relate to the quality of development and the preservation or enhancement of the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR