
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 24 April 2017

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/W/16/3166212

81 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 8HA

- 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 Frederique Rival against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 16/AP/0049, dated 7 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension by replacing the existing double pitch roof with a mansard.
-

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/Y/17/3167641

81 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 8HA

- 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 Frederique Rival against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 16/AP/0050, dated 7 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2016.
 - The works proposed are a roof extension by replacing the existing double pitch roof with a mansard.
-

Decisions

1. The appeals are both dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in these appeals is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 5 storey Georgian terraced house dating from around 1800. The property is grade II listed and its special interest derives from the fact that it is a surviving example of a high quality Georgian development, which retains a number of original features. The basement and elevated ground floor elevations are rendered, with brick work on the subsequent floors. The window size and proportions follow the classical pattern and reflect the hierarchy of the floors with size diminishing on the higher floors.
4. The roof of the appeal property is formed by 2 pitches with ridges running parallel to the front and rear elevations; referred to as a 'M' shaped roof

throughout the appeal papers. The neighbouring property at Nos 82-83 (numbering is consecutive along this section) has a mansard roof, as does Nos 79-80. The remainder of the properties in this stretch of Blackfriars Road have M shaped roofs, from Nos 75 to 86. Nos 79-80 is not listed and it is pointed out that the mansard at Nos 82-83 was constructed in the 1970s following substantial rebuilding works and prior to the property being listed. Apart from No 79-80, all of these properties are grade II listed buildings.

5. The proposal would involve the complete replacement of the existing roof with a mansard extension which would provide additional living accommodation. The face of the mansard would be set back at the front with a roof terrace provided, and the rear mansard face would be immediately behind a parapet wall.
6. From my own observations and from the evidence submitted it is clear that the existing roof has been subjected to some works over its lifetime and these have included the provision of an access hatch, repair/replacement works and alterations to the party wall/chimney. The Council and others had expressed concerns at the loss of historic fabric (as well as the historic form) and in response the appellant has submitted a report relating to the existing roof structure; it appears that the Council do not seek to contradict the findings of this report. In summary, it states that the rear roof structure is original with some minor inserts; within the front roof there is evidence of an amount of reconstruction (possibly immediately post-war) including modern rafters although some timber was probably re-used; the front coping stones on the parapet are original whilst the rear has been replaced by concrete; the natural slates covering the whole roof are original but have been relaid with roofing felt underneath.
7. Whilst the appellant indicates that the original centre valley beam would be kept, I consider that the loss of the remainder of the fabric as described above and more fully in the appellant's documents would involve the loss of a significant amount of historic fabric which would be harmful to the listed building.
8. In relation to the form of the roof, I readily acknowledge the presence of the mansard roofs on both neighbouring properties. However, these have been provided on a non-listed building in the case of Nos 79-80 and from what the Council states, the works at Nos 82-83 were undertaken prior to listing and in any event as part of major works. In addition, looking beyond these immediate neighbours, the remainder of this group of listed buildings retains the form of their original M shaped roofs. I accept that the roofs are not easily seen from any public vantage points and it is likely that the proposal would only be visible in a limited way however, this would not reduce the harm to the listed building that would arise from the loss of historic fabric and the loss of the historic form of its roof. The fact that, perhaps unsympathetic, alterations have been done nearby does not set a precedent for works that I find would be harmful to the listed building.
9. The Council also refer to the proposed window sizes and form within the roof extension. I agree that the proposed windows would fail to conform to the clear hierarchy of reducing size as one progresses up the building. This adds to my findings relating to the harm to the listed building that would arise from the scheme.

10. The appellant indicates that the proposal would involve a benefit to the listed building by the reinstatement of an original but lost feature, namely the gas-lantern. Although no further details have been presented by which to judge this, I consider that this would be insufficient to outweigh the harm to the historic asset that would be brought about by the proposed roof alterations.

Conclusions

11. The proposal would result in the unacceptable loss of historic fabric and the loss of the historic form of the roof of this listed building. This would fail to preserve its special architectural and historic interest and would harm its significance. In relation to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, I consider this harm to be 'less than substantial' and I have sought to balance this against any public benefits as set out by the appellant. In my judgement the benefits are insufficient to outweigh the harm. As a consequence, the proposal is contrary to Policy SP12 of the Core Strategy and saved Policies 3.12, 3.15, 3.17 and 3.18 of the Southwark Plan and the advice in the Framework. Therefore, the appeals are dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR