



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: 14 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/W/21/3266428

44 Nunhead Green, London SE15 3QF

- 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 Bryan Brewster against the decision of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 20/AP/2087, dated 27 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is conversion and change of use for ground floor rear to create new studio apartment.
-

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 whether the proposed development would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers with regard to outlook.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is formed of vacant premises sited to the rear of a commercial unit located within a retail parade. The premises are accessed from an existing alley that also provides access to flats located on the upper floors of the host property.
5. I acknowledge that the proposed studio apartment would meet minimum space standards and have adequate ventilation. I also note that the skylights would provide a degree of natural light and future occupiers would have access to an outdoor area. However, the apartment would be single aspect and taking into consideration the depth and layout of the apartment, the size and position of the window and its close proximity to a tall fence it would have very limited outlook resulting in an unduly oppressive environment.
6. I conclude that the proposed development would not provide future occupiers with adequate living conditions contrary to Policies 3.12 and 4.2 of the

Southwark Local Plan (2007) which, amongst other things, seek high amenity environments and good quality living conditions including high standards of outlook.

7. It would also be contrary to guidance contained within the Council's Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2011) which, amongst other things, requires living areas and bedrooms to achieve adequate outlook.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide additional housing, that it may reduce incidents of anti-social behaviour and fly-tipping and the premises is redundant. However, these factors would not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.
9. Given the scale of the development the economic and social benefits would be modest and would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

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

B Thandi

INSPECTOR