

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2019

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/W/19/3234722
189 & 191 Queens Road, London SE15 2ND

- 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 Tashfeen Imtiaz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 19/AP/1305, dated 1 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension to create third floor at Nos. 189 & 191 to provide two studios.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Queens Road has a mixed character and appearance, with a mixture of residential, commercial and retail properties, often within the same buildings and terraces. Despite the mixed appearance in the wider area, there is a general consistency in the immediate area of terraced, 3 to 4 storey buildings. Streets around Queens Road, such as Astbury Road to the rear are more consistently residential in nature, and typically smaller scale than the buildings on Queens Road itself.
4. The appeal site is made up of two properties within a three-storey terrace fronting onto Queens Road, at the junction with Astbury Road. The front elevation of the terrace has an attractive symmetry, highlighted by brickwork detailing, pattern of fenestration and chimneys.
5. The appeal site adjoins another property, 193 Queens Road, which has previously lengthened the terrace and has an existing, relatively recent roof-extension. By virtue of its materials, pattern of fenestration and siting, No 193 appears distinct from the appeal site and its symmetrical neighbours.
6. The group sits somewhat back from the pavement edge, behind a row of single-storey retail and commercial premises. The end and rear of the terrace is visible from the public domain. The relative complexity of the rear elevation contrasts with the simpler front elevation.

7. The proposed roof extension would be visible from both Queens Road and Astbury Road. From Queens Road it would appear as a clearly modern addition to the terrace, similar in form and scale to that at No 193. However, the existing roof extension at No 193 sits over only one property which has itself been rendered, further distinguishing it from the appeal site. It also adjoins a more modern building.
8. In contrast, the appeal proposal relates to the more detailed and prominent part of the terrace. As a result, the proposed extension would appear large, unbalanced and awkward. It would unbalance the symmetry of the terrace from the front and in longer views along Queens Road. This would, in my opinion, cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
9. To the rear, the articulation and detail of the rear elevation of the terrace would be lost. The proposal would lead to the loss of the traditional butterfly roof and the hip-to-gable extension. The bulk of the rear of the building would be significantly increased, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
10. I accept that the site is not within a conservation area, the building is not listed, the design broadly mirrors that of the neighbouring property and that other properties in the street may have lost their butterfly roofs. I note that the proposal is acceptable in terms of space standards, amenity, cycle parking, bin storage and access to public transport. I also note the proposed use of sustainable design and construction methods. However, these factors do not lead me to find in favour of a proposal which I consider would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
11. I also accept that the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) encourages the delivery of homes and seeks to promote both sustainable development and the efficient use of land. However, this is qualified against the need to deliver well-designed places. The harm I have identified above in relation to the character and appearance of the area outweighs these matters and the benefits identified by the appellant.
12. A number of buildings opposite the site are Grade II listed and the application was advertised as affecting their setting. Given the distance between them and the appeal site, the mixed nature of the street-scene, and the nature of the proposal, I consider that the proposal would not harm or adversely affect their setting or features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.
13. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Strategic Policy 12 of the Southwark Council Core Strategy April 2011, Policy 3.12 (saved in 2013) of the Southwark Plan 2007. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development delivers the highest possible standards of design, complements and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of an area, and is of a high quality which has regard to the existing form, positive elements and character of an area.

14. The proposal would also conflict with the aim of the Framework to achieve well-designed places which are sympathetic to local character and history.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Dean

INSPECTOR