



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/W/19/3241597

4 Ardbeg Road, London SE24 9JL

- 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 Suleyman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 19/AP/5189, dated 30 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is extensions to and conversion of existing property, currently operating as three flats (1 x 1 bedroom and 2 x 2 bedroom), to 1 x 4 bedroom house and 1 x 5 bedroom house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for extensions to and conversion of existing property, currently operating as three flats (1 x 1 bedroom and 2 x 2 bedroom), to 1 x 4 bedroom house and 1 x 5 bedroom house at 4 Ardbeg Road, London SE24 9JL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 19/AP/5189, dated 30 August 2019 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 000, 001, 002, 003, 021, 022, 031, 032, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 201, 202, 301, 302 & 303.
 - 3) No development above ground works (slab level) shall commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.
 - 4) Before the first occupation of the development, the refuse storage arrangements shall be provided as detailed on the drawings hereby approved and shall be made available for use. Thereafter, they shall be retained for their intended purpose for the lifetime of the development.
 - 5) Before the first occupation of the development, the cycle storage facilities as shown on the drawings hereby approved shall be provided

and made available for use. Thereafter, they shall be retained for their intended purpose for the lifetime of the development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Ardbeg Road is a quiet residential street which is dominated by traditional and substantial terraced and semi-detached residential property incorporating attractive detailing which contributes to a very pleasant street scene.
4. At first floor level and above there is a modest gap between 4 Ardbeg Road (No 4) and the property immediately to the north east. However, this size of gap is the exception, rather than the normal on the street. Gaps between properties are generally much smaller, limited to narrow gaps to provide pathways to the rear of the properties.
5. The gap that currently exists cannot therefore be considered an important townscape feature. The much narrower gap that would remain as a result of the proposal would be more in keeping with the prevailing character of property spacing on the street. Further, garages are not a common feature. That which exists at No 4 is out of keeping with the street.
6. The side extension has been designed to substantially match the design of the existing property, retaining the same roof arrangement and general detailing and proportions. It would not result in any significant loss of symmetry between No 4 and No 2 Ardbeg Road, as the evidence indicates that the neighbouring property has previously been extended in a manner similar to that proposed under the scheme before me, although with slightly different features within the extension such as the garage door at basement level.
7. The side extension would incorporate a roof which matches that on the existing property in terms of its shape and pitch. I am not convinced that the inclusion of a further front door, which would be simpler than the much grander existing main front door would result in the extension forming an insubordinate feature.
8. I do not interpret the SPD¹ guidance as suggesting that the upper floor should be set away from the side boundary. Rather it suggests that where the side extension is proposed to be more than single storey, the upper floor should be set back from the side building line. Even if the guidance was interpreted to have the former meaning, this would not be appropriate as it would create imbalance between the semi-detached properties in relation to this site, which would be material to departing from the guidance.
9. I conclude therefore that the side extension would be appropriate in relation to the character and appearance of the area and would therefore accord with Policy 3.12 of the Southwark Plan (2007) (SP) and SPD² guidance which amongst other things seek proposals of high quality architectural and urban design.

¹ Southwark Council 2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2011).

² Southwark Council 2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2011) & Southwark Council Dulwich Supplementary Planning Document (2013).

10. I have not identified any conflict with Policy 6.9 of the London Plan (2016) (LP) or Policy 5.3 of the SP which amongst other things promote cycling. I also find no conflict with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the LP nor policies, 3.12 or 3.13 of the SP which amongst other things require proposals of good quality architecture and design which are appropriate to local character.
11. Further, I find no conflict with Policies 3.11, 4.2 and 4.3 of the SP which require quality residential accommodation in an appropriate mix which makes an efficient use of land. I have not identified any significant adverse transport impact of the proposal and there would not be conflict with policies 5.2 and 6.3 of the SP which relate to this matter.
12. I have also not identified conflict with Policies 1, 2, 5, 12 and 13 of the Southwark Core Strategy (2011) which amongst other things require the promotion of sustainable development including transport and appropriate housing provision which is of a good standard which protects heritage assets.

Other Matters

13. The Council have not identified any significant adverse impact on the living conditions of those nearby, be that in relation to such matters as any effect on daylight or sunlight, traffic or noise and I have no reason to disagree. The same is the case in relation to the living conditions of future occupiers at the site.

Conditions

14. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three-year time limit. Final details of materials are required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. It is necessary that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. Conditions relating to waste and cycle storage are necessary to promote sustainable waste management and encourage sustainable modes of transport. I have not included a condition relating to boiler efficiency as no direct policy justification has been included whilst there is no evidence of substantial noise sources in immediate proximity to necessitate a condition to control such an issue.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR