

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2017

by William Fieldhouse BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/17/3171046

12 Hayles Street, London SE11 4SS

- 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 Andrew Mackersie against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application ref 16/AP/4237, dated 13 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the addition of a mansard roof to the main house and to the rear outrigger to accommodate two bedrooms and a shared bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the property and the West Square Conservation Area within which the site is located.

Reasons

3. The West Square Conservation Area comprises a high quality late Georgian and mid 19th century townscape, with a number of significant public buildings, open spaces and terraced houses that combine into frontages that define streets, spaces and views. Hayles Street includes a number of blocks of terraces which are of similar design but which vary in original height from two to four storeys.
4. The appeal property is at the northern end of a row of seven three-storey houses all of which have a high parapet wall to the street capped with a cornice with decorative molding. Whilst four of the originally two-storey houses in the terrace of five to the north of the appeal property have mansard roof extensions, none of those in the block comprising nos. 12-24 do. Both of these rows of houses are identified as "key unlisted buildings" in the conservation area appraisal. Beyond the back gardens of the properties on this side of Hayles Street are the rear elevations of the grade II listed terraced houses on West Square all but one of which have mansard roof extensions.
5. No. 12 is in good condition and retains much of its original character when viewed from the street and from private properties to the rear. The proposal would entail the replacement of an existing hidden decked roof terrace and sedum roof that was built following the grant of planning permission in 2014, with a mansard roof extension over the main house and outrigger.

6. Mansard roof extensions are not an alien form of development in the conservation area as such additions have been made to numerous buildings including immediately to the north and to the rear of the appeal property. Some are largely hidden, particularly from public vantage points. Those to the north of no. 12 are visible from the street, but due to their set back position and limited height have little impact on the street scene other than that at no. 10 which can be more clearly seen from the road to the south due to the significant gap between it and the appeal property.
7. Whilst the elevated and set back position of the proposal means that it would not be prominent when seen from the street in front of the property or from the south, the gap between nos. 10 and 12 means that it would be quite apparent when approaching along Hayles Street from the north. It would also be clearly seen from the houses opposite and, at a greater distance, from those to the rear. From these perspectives the proposal would stand out high above the existing uniform roof level of nos. 12 to 24. Despite the fenestration and materials matching the existing, by being the only such addition to that row of houses, the proposal would to my mind detract somewhat from that particular group of buildings which at present make a positive contribution to the conservation area due to their largely unaltered nature.
8. I conclude that the proposal would cause some harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. It would, therefore, be contrary to national policy¹; policies 3.12, 3.13 and 3.16 of the Southwark Plan 2007; and policy 12 of the Southwark Core Strategy 2011. Collectively these policies seek to ensure the highest possible standards of architectural and urban design that has regard to the height, scale and massing of buildings and local context and character, and that all development conserves or enhances the significance of Southwark's heritage assets. The proposal would also fail to comply with Council guidance that advises that roof extensions will not be allowed where additional floors in any form would harm the architectural integrity of a building or unity of a group².
9. In accordance with relevant legislation and national policy, in determining this appeal I attach great weight to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area³. Whilst the harm that I have identified would be limited, and certainly less than substantial, it would not be outweighed by the limited public benefits that would arise from creating additional living accommodation in an already good-sized family home.

Conclusion

10. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

William Fieldhouse

INSPECTOR

¹ National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sections 7 and 12.

² 2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2011.

³ Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and NPPF paragraph 132.