



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/21/3273675

First floor and second floor flat, 49B Nunhead Lane, London SE15 3TR

- 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 Ms Carolina Filippini against the decision of London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 21/AP/0142, dated 14 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with new front roof, 2 rooflights at the new front roof, rear dormer and a roof terrace over the outrigger.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a first and second floor flat within a terrace of seven late Georgian / early Victorian properties. The terrace has a largely uniform appearance with high parapet front walls that hide butterfly roofs behind. The property has a flat-roofed rear outrigger serving the ground, first and upper first floors.
4. Other than the roof extension to 45 Nunhead Lane the terrace has a uniform character of butterfly roofs and parapet walls. The extension at No 45 is part of the terrace's character and appearance but it is not the overriding characteristic of it or the remaining unbroken run of butterfly roofs which the appeal property forms part of in the terrace.
5. The proposed development would result in the loss of the property's butterfly roof and the roof extension would rise above the front parapet of the property. The extension would be evident from Nunhead Lane in either direction on the southern side of the road and from Carden Road even considering the street tree in front of No 49B. Moreover, the rear dormer and roof terrace would be visible from Old James Street. The proposal to the front and rear would not in my opinion be discrete additions to the property or the terrace. Despite the extension at No 45 the appeal scheme would harm the remaining cohesive appearance of the terrace and the historic butterfly roof. The use of a condition to secure suitable materials would not overcome this harm or mean that the appeal scheme would have a negligible impact on the surrounding area.

6. The modern infill development at 35 to 41 Nunhead Lane may be an example of increased scale within the context of the street scene, but it would not have a butterfly roof such as that on the appeal property. As such, the comparison is not a direct one.
7. By extending the property additional internal and external living space would be formed which would be beneficial to the occupants. No harm would also be caused to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, subject to the use of obscure glazing.
8. However, I conclude that the adverse harm that the proposed development would cause to the character and appearance of the area would outweigh these matters. Thus, the proposal would not accord with saved Policies 3.12 and 3.13 of The Southwark Plan, Strategic Policy 12 of the Core Strategy and the 2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards (2011). Jointly these seek high quality design that is appropriate to local context with roof extensions not permitted where there is an unbroken run of butterfly roofs.
9. Conflict would also be caused with Policies P12 and P13 of the New Southwark Plan Proposed Submission Version which seek development that responds positively to the existing townscape, character and context. However, due to the stage of their preparation and as I do not know the extent of any unresolved objections these policies carry limited weight.

Other Matter

10. I agree with the Council's assessment that the proposed development would preserve the setting of St Antony's Church, a grade II listed building and the Nunhead Green Conservation Area due to the range of building styles and heights found in the area. Whilst the proposal would alter the terrace's appearance this would not cause harm to the setting of either heritage asset. As such, the proposal's effect would be neutral in both cases.

Conclusion

11. 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.
12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR