



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 27 July 2021

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/21/3268822

58 Nutfield Road, London SE22 9DG

- 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 Alex Skinner against the decision of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 20/AP/3342, dated 12 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is front and rear mansard roof, floor plan redesign and all associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey mid terrace dwelling located within a predominantly residential area. Despite minor variations the host property sits within a group of terrace properties that display uniform roof lines and largely consistent parapets that allow views of chimneys from street level. The coherent form and appearance of the properties including their roofs disguised behind a parapet positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area resulting in a pleasant residential street scene.
5. The increased height and bulk of the roof and the size and design of the dormer windows would unacceptably change the simple roof form of the host property and would interrupt the unaltered and coherent roofscape along this part of the road resulting in unacceptable harm.

6. Despite a setback the proposed development on account of its height and bulk would be visually prominent from street level drawing the eye and appearing as an incongruous feature along the terrace being the only roof alteration in an otherwise uninterrupted run of dwellings.
7. As such, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area contrary to Policies 3.12 and 3.13 of the Southwark Local Plan (2007), Strategic Policy 12 of the Southwark Core Strategy (2011) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) which, amongst other things, seek a high quality of architectural and urban design, new development that is appropriate to local context and that makes a positive contribution to the character of an area.

Other Matters

8. My attention has been drawn to the presence of other examples of mansard roofs in the road. The circumstances behind each development is likely to be different and in any event every appeal must be considered on its own merits, as I have done in this case. The presence of other roof extensions in the area is not a reason to allow unacceptable development and does not lead me to reach a different conclusion on the matter.
9. I acknowledge that areas evolve over time, but it is important that they do so in a manner appropriate to their character. In this particular regard I have found that the proposed development would not.
10. I acknowledge that the London Plan promotes the efficient use of land in established neighbourhoods. However, it also recognises that developments should be sensitive to its surroundings.
11. I note the comments that the proposal would provide additional floorspace for the appellant's family. However, I am mindful of the advice contained in the Planning Practice Guidance that in general, planning is concerned with land use in the public interest. It is probable that the proposal would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to be material. For this reason, I find that this factor is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.
12. The appellant has referred to new permitted development rights relating to the construction of additional storeys. However, I have seen nothing to suggest that this is a genuine option if the appeal failed or that such a scheme would be similar to what is currently proposed. As such, I give that argument limited weight in coming to my decision.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above the appeal does not succeed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR