



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 September 2021

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/W/20/3265541

189 Queens Road, London SE15 2ND

- 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 Tashfeen Imtiaz against the decision of London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 20/AP/2547, dated 7 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is construct of third floor to No. 189 to create one number of self contained unit (1xstudio).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The red edge of the Proposed Site Plan includes 189 and 191 Queens Road however the appeal scheme clearly only relates to No 189 as no development is shown on the submitted plans insofar as No 191. The address set out above therefore reflects this and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms part of a terrace fronting Queens Road near to its junction with Astbury Road. Queens Road has a varied character and appearance due to the range of residential, commercial and retail properties which populate it. Streets leading off Queens Road are more residential in nature with smaller scale buildings than those which line Queens Road which are generally 3 to 4 storeys high. The frontage of the terrace has attractive brickwork detailing and a regular pattern of fenestration. The terrace sits back from the row of single storey commercial properties that line Queens Road.
5. Although 193 Queens Road has elongated the terrace and it has a flat-roofed extension above, it is finished in different materials and it has not carried through the same brick detailing or pattern of fenestration. So, while it adjoins the terrace it is not read as a coherent part of it.
6. The proposed extension to the roof would be visible from either direction on Queens Road and between the gap in the built form on Astbury Road. Based on the submitted plans the proposal would have a lower scale than the extension

at No 193 and be lower than the current ridge line of No 189. Nevertheless, the appeal scheme would interrupt the uniform roofline of the terrace and occupy the full width of the property. Even if the scale of the proposal were considered to be minor, it would harm the cohesiveness of the terrace from short-and longer-range views on Queens Road, and in turn the character and appearance of the area.

7. A bulky and discordant form of development would be added to the rear of the terrace. This would unbalance the pairing of Nos 189 and 191 and result in the loss of the hipped roof form. The design of the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst views of the rear of the terrace may be more limited this does not change my view about the proposal's effect. The proposed use of materials would not lessen that harm given the proposal's bulky design.
8. The proposal would make effective use of land, ensure the ground floor commercial units will remain, add to the supply of housing in an accessible location and not harm future or neighbouring occupants living conditions subject to the use of conditions. Sustainable design and construction methods are also proposed by the appellant. However, even if the site is not located within a Conservation Area or within the setting of a Listed Building, there is a need to deliver well-designed places, high quality buildings and places. The proposal would not achieve this and the harm that I have found outweighs the other matters highlighted by the appellant.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with saved Policy 3.12 of the Southwark Plan 2007, Strategic Policy 12 of the Core Strategy, Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021 and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which jointly, among other things, expect development to be of a high quality that responds to the existing character of a place with architecture that pays attention to detail.

Conclusion

10. I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the Development Plan and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this.
11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR