
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2019

by Andre Pinto BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/19/3240596
65 Grove Hill Road, London SE5 8DF

- 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 Neunie against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 19/AP/1812, dated 17 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the addition of a second storey extension and replacement of new windows to existing terrace to match adjoining property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a quiet residential street characterised by terraced rows of two storey and three storey dwellings, arranged in broadly symmetrical pairs, along a gentle slope. Although varied, the dwellings along the street share similar details to others of a comparable height, providing a harmonious feel to the area and a pleasant rhythm to the street. This greatly contributes to the character and appearance of the area. The site lies in close proximity to, but outside of, the Camberwell Conservation Area.
4. The three storey dwellings are mostly located on higher ground, at the western end of Grove Hill Road towards its intersection with Camberwell Grove. As the natural gradient slopes down eastwards, towards the intersection with Ivanhoe Road, the general height of the dwellings appears to broadly follow the slope, going down, generally, from three to two storey dwellings. Nevertheless, the symmetry that characterises the properties at the western end of the street can still be felt at the eastern end, with most dwellings arranged in generally symmetrical pairs along the terraced row.
5. The appeal site shares several design details and features with 67 Grove Hill Road, with which it is paired. This is particularly emphasised by the use of the same style of coloured brick work across both properties, shared eaves height and similar style of mouldings. Although some of the features that help define

the character of the appeal site are also present at 63 Grove Hill Road, the architectural relationship is stronger with 67 Grove Hill Road.

6. The proposed development is for the addition of an extension across the whole front elevation of the host building, turning the present two storey dwelling into a three storey dwelling.
7. The proposed extension would bring the host building broadly in line, in terms of its overall height and the alignment of windows, with 63 Grove Hill Road. Nonetheless, due to the stronger design associations with its other immediate neighbour as outlined above, there is a much greater need to demonstrate architectural continuity and consistency with 67 Grove Hill Road rather than with No 63.
8. The proposed development, due to its form, design and height, would be clearly visible from the street. Consequently, it would create a marked imbalance and disturb the relationship with No 67 as outlined above. This would result in a significant and unwelcomed effect on the street scene of this part of Grove Hill Road.
9. Therefore, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, in that regard it would be contrary to Policies 3.12 (Quality in Design) and 3.13 (Urban Design) of the Southwark Plan 2007, Strategic Policy 12 (Design and Conservation) of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policy 7.4 (Local Character) of the London Plan, as well as with Section 12 (Achieving well-designed places) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. My attention has been drawn to other roof extensions, including those at 42 and 79 Grove Hill Road. I am not aware of the details or particular circumstances of these other cases, but I note the relevant planning history regarding the extension at No 79. This differs significantly in scale, bulk, form and design from the development proposed in this appeal. In any event, I must determine the proposal before me on its own merits and for the reasons stated I consider the proposed development would be harmful. I have, nonetheless, taken such existing development into account when making my assessment of the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of the area.
11. No particular public benefits have been brought to my attention in relation to the proposed development, albeit I recognise that there would be private benefits for the occupants of the dwelling. I also acknowledge that there would be some public benefit in terms of improving housing stock and that the investment would be of some benefit to the local economy. However, any such public benefits would be very modest given the small scale of the development thus carrying only limited weight relative to the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

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

Andre Pinto

INSPECTOR