

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2021

by **Simon Warder MA BSc(Hons) DipUD(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/21/3266932

118 Landells Road, London SE22 9PJ

- 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 Sirakov against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark
 - The application Ref 20/AP/2900, dated 6 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is proposed loft conversion/extension to include ridge height increase (450mm) and rear dormer and two roof lights to front roofslope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion/extension to include ridge height increase (450mm) and rear dormer and two roof lights to front roofslope at 118 Landells Road, London SE22 9PJ in accordance with the terms of the application, 20/AP/2900, dated 6 October 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plan reference PP-20-004 P-101.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing house, the terrace and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey terraced house which matches the design of the four properties to the south (116-110). The properties to the north are narrower and deeper, giving their roofs higher ridgelines. This part of Landells Road also rises to the south. In combination therefore, the ridgelines of each of the houses in this part of the terrace are at different heights. Moreover, there is a range of house designs and there have been a considerable number of roof extensions to other properties along Landells Road creating further variations in ridge heights.
-

4. The proposed roof extension would increase the ridge height of the appeal property by 450mm. The extended roof would be lower than that of 120, slightly higher than 116 and about the same height as 114. The pitch of the roof would not alter and a simple, single ridgeline spanning the full width of the property would be maintained. The party wall parapet to the rear of the chimney stack would be raised and two rooflights inserted into the front roof slope.
5. The alterations would be visible from public views, particularly from the north along Landells Road. However, the change to the party wall parapet would not be conspicuous and, in the context of the existing variation in ridgelines, the proposed increase in the ridge height would not appear excessive and would not disrupt the composition of the terrace as a whole. Nor would the proposed rooflights be out of keeping.
6. The Council has expressed a degree of concern regarding the visual impact of the rear dormer element of the proposal on the existing dwelling. However, as the Council also acknowledges, views of this element would be restricted. As such I share the view that the effect in this case would not justify withholding permission.
7. Overall therefore, I find that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing house, the terrace or the streetscene. As such, it would accord with Policy 12 of the Council's Core Strategy 2012 and Policies 3.12 and 3.13 of the Southwark Local Plan 2007. Together, these policies seek high quality design and appropriate solutions specific to the site and location taking into account the height, scale and massing of the buildings. The proposal would also be consistent with section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it has similar aims. Nor would the proposal conflict with the advice on roof extensions in the Council's 2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards (2011) Supplementary Planning Document.

Conditions

8. The Council has suggested a list of three conditions, including the time limit for commencement. A condition requiring the external materials used to match the existing building is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. A condition specifying the approved plan is necessary in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be allowed.

Simon Warder

INSPECTOR