



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/W/20/3252760

65B Kings Grove, London, SE15 2NA

- 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 Robin Thompson against the decision of the London Borough of Southwark Council.
 - The application Ref 19/AP/7509, dated 19 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a mansard roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a mansard roof extension at 65B Kings Grove, London, SE15 2NA, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 19/AP/7509, dated 19 December 2019 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 114-A00, 114-A10 Rev 01, 114-A11 Rev 01, 114-A12 Rev 01, 114-A15 Rev 01, 114-A20 Rev 01, 114-A21 Rev 01, 114-A22 Rev 01, 114-A23 Rev 01, 114-A25-a Rev 00, 114-A25-b Rev 01 and 114-A30 Rev 01.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a three-storey terraced dwelling located on the western side of King's Grove. The property forms part of a terrace with a
-

continuous 'butterfly'-type roof form dating from the mid-19th Century. The surrounding area is mostly residential with a mix of terraced housing and apartment blocks.

5. The proposal will result in a mansard roof extension with two flush fitting rooflights inserted into the front and rear slopes. The Council has expressed concern regarding the scale and position of the proposed roof and its effect on the appearance of the host dwelling and the terrace it forms part of. However, it would appear as a low-profile mansard roof set-in behind the front parapet wall of the existing building, the resultant height of the extension would not appear excessive, and it would tie in with the scale of the building as a whole. I concur with the appellant in that the proposed design is consistent with the age and character of the host dwelling.
6. I acknowledge that the proposal would breach the ridge line and interrupt the unbroken run of butterfly roofs prevalent along the western side of the road, which is not supported by the Technical Update (2015) to the 'Residential Design Standards' Supplementary Planning Document. However, due to the low profile and slanted roof angle of the mansard I find that it would sit modestly in its position and would not be easily visible within the street scene. The distinctive front parapet cornice would remain in place and continue to maintain a strong visual expression against the sky. In my view, the historical character and appearance of the terrace would be preserved.
7. Although the development would alter the V-shape rear parapet and be visible when viewed from surrounding buildings to the rear, its appearance would not be obtrusive or unacceptably harm the townscape.
8. I therefore find the proposed roof extension would be compatible with the existing building and would not result in a bulky or visually discordant feature that would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, terrace and surrounding area.
9. Given the above, the proposed development would therefore not conflict with Policy 12 of the Core Strategy Development Plan document, Policies 3.12 & 3.13 of the Southwark Local Plan, and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan which together aim to ensure proposals are well-designed and respect the character of their surroundings. I have also had regard to the aims of the Technical Update (2015) to the 'Residential Design Standards' Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework which seek the same.

Other Matters

10. I note concerns have been raised with regards to drainage arrangements for the roof and the lack of a structural survey as well as with regards to the party wall with No. 67. However, these are not planning matters that have had any bearing on my decision.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested a number of conditions that it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal was successful. I have considered the suggested conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance.

12. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have also included a condition requiring the external materials match the existing building, to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR