



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 26 July 2021

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/20/3259978

77 Marmont Road, London SE15 5TB

- 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 Miss Carla Grundy against the decision of London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 20/AP/1976, dated 17 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is new loft conversion.
-

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 residential street. The property sits within a group of terrace properties that display uniform roof lines and the parapet of properties along this side of the road are of a consistent height and appearance and allow glimpsed views of chimneys and arials from street level. The form of the main roof disguised behind a parapet positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area resulting in a coherent and pleasant residential street scene.
5. The proposed development would unacceptably change the roofscape and significantly disrupting the simple form and appearance of the host property's roof. The increased bulk of the roof would interrupt the unaltered and coherent roof form along the road resulting in unacceptable harm.
6. Notwithstanding the parapet the proposed development on account of its height, bulk and appearance would be visually prominent from street level drawing the eye and appearing as an incongruous feature along the otherwise

uninterrupted terrace. Consequently, it would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

7. The proposed development would be contrary to Strategic Policy 12 of the Southwark Core Strategy (2011) and saved policies 3.12 and 3.13 of the Southwark Local Plan (2013) which, amongst other things, seek the highest standards of design, the enhancement of the quality of the built environment and new development that is appropriate to the local context.
8. It would also be contrary to guidance set out in the 2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document which, amongst other things, seeks to prevent harm to the architectural integrity of a building or the unity of a group and where a roof extension would interrupt an unbroken run of butterfly roofs.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has made reference to roof extensions in the area. However, I have not been made aware of the individual circumstances that led to them being constructed. In any event, every appeal must be considered on its own merits, as I have done in this case. The presence of other roof alterations does not lead me to reach a different conclusion on the matter.
10. Whilst the appellant has made some design changes following the Council's decision, in the interests of fairness, I must ensure that what is considered at appeal is what was considered by the Council. I therefore have not taken these amendments into account.

Conclusion

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

B Thandi

INSPECTOR