

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 21 September 2021 by Emma Grierson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/21/3277368

175 Bellenden Road, London SE15 4DG

- 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 Eliot Postma against the decision of London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 21/AP/0330, dated 30 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a mansard loft extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a mansard loft extension at 175 Bellenden Road, London SE15 4DG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/AP/0330, dated 30 January 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A104 Rev A, A110 Rev A, A210 Rev A and A311 Rev A.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no. A210 Rev A.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration in my decision-making, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace in which it is located and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a three-storey Victorian terrace dwelling. It is located at the end of a row of other similarly styled three-storey terrace dwellings, but also adjoins a row of two-storey terraced properties. The dwelling has a traditional butterfly roof and has undergone various extensions to the rear of the property. However, the front elevation matches others within the terrace, providing a uniformity along this section of Bellenden Road which has a positive impact on the character and appearance of the area.
6. The 2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2011) states that roof extensions will not be permitted where there is an unbroken run of butterfly roofs. The appeal property is part of a row of five terrace dwellings with butterfly roofs which have not undergone development and form an unbroken run. Therefore, the proposed mansard roof extension would be contrary to this guidance.
7. However, due to the height of the building and the existing parapet wall, the proposal would have limited visibility from street level with only some views of the side elevation due to the end of terrace location. Therefore, the proposed roof extension and loss of the existing butterfly roof would not have a significant impact on the streetscene, and the terrace would still appear largely uniform from this vantage point.
8. The proposal would be more readily visible from the rear of the dwelling due to the nature of the roof, and the insertion of the extension would undoubtedly have an impact on the visual setting of the butterfly roof form. However, due to previous extensions, the terrace does not currently possess a cohesive appearance to the rear, and on the basis of the detailed design of the proposal and my own observations, I am satisfied that the butterfly roof form would still be able to be read architecturally. Furthermore, the size of the proposed mansard roof is modest, set back from the eaves and relatively low in height, and the proposed design and materials are in keeping with other similar properties within the vicinity. Therefore, on balance, the proposal would not appear as a harmful addition to the host property or the surrounding area.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, host terrace and the surrounding area and would comply with Policies 3.12 and 3.13 of the Southwark Plan (2007) and Policy 12 of the Core Strategy (2011). These policies collectively require alterations to an existing building to embody creative and high-quality design solutions which are appropriate to the local context and help create attractive and distinctive places.
10. The proposal would also accord with the general design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. Policy 3.15 of the Southwark Plan (2007) is not relevant to the appeal before me as this policy relates to the conservation of the historic environment.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have attached a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty and precision. A condition requiring the use of materials to be in accordance with those stated on the submitted plans is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Emma Grierson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR