



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 March 2022 by C Glaister BSc (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/21/3285278

110 Albany Road, London SE5 0DA

- 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 Matthias Dinnis against the decision of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 21/AP/2473, dated 14 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as "Alterations to a roof to create a loft conversion using a front & rear mansard extension, plus an extension over the rear outrigger, to provide additional residential accommodation".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the terrace as a whole.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The site is a two-storey mid-terrace property. The dwelling has a butterfly roof, and is between properties which share the same roof form. Each property along this stretch of the terrace has a parapet wall on its façade which obscures the roofs when viewed from Albany Road. This, together with the design and fenestration of each dwelling, gives this portion of the terrace a uniform appearance.
5. The proposal would replace the butterfly roof with a mansard roof of a greater height. It would break the run of butterfly roofs towards the middle and would be visible above the parapet wall when viewed from Albany Road. It would appear incongruous and inharmonious, and would disrupt the uniform character of the terrace. Consequently, harm would arise to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the terrace as a whole.
6. The 2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards (2011) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides guidance relating to roof extensions. It states that roof extensions will not be permitted where there is

an unbroken run of butterfly roofs and on buildings and in terraces which are completed compositions. The proposal would not align with the guidance provided in the SPD.

7. The appeal is considered with regard to its own individual merits. Full details of the development on Smyrk's Road have not been provided. However, it is not part of the immediate context of the appeal site and would not in any case justify or mitigate the harm that has been identified. The roof extensions on Mina Road are mostly located towards the end of the terrace and are amongst buildings which are taller. These roof extensions do not share the same context of the appeal site and do not justify or mitigate the harm associated with the proposal.
8. The pitched roofs to the east of the appeal site are at an angle to the rest of the properties and form a clearly distinct end-section of the terrace. The mono-pitch roof at the western end of the terrace finishes the run of butterfly roofs and is not visible above the parapet. The run of butterfly roofs remains between both of these other roof forms, and neither element mitigates the harm that would arise from the mansard roof. Retaining the pattern of outrigger roofs is a neutral matter. There is no guarantee that all other properties along the terrace with butterfly roofs would choose to undertake development that is similar to the proposal, and this therefore holds very little weight which would not outweigh the harm.
9. For these reasons, the development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the terrace as a whole. It would therefore fail to comply with Policy 12 of the Southwark Core Strategy (April 2011) and saved Policies 3.12 and 3.13 of the Southwark Plan (2007) which together seek to ensure development is of a high quality and is appropriate to the local context. It would also fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework and its aim to ensure development is sympathetic to local character. Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) is strategic in nature and deals with the design and review process. It is not directly relevant to the appeal scheme. However, the development would nevertheless conflict with its overarching objective to ensure the delivery of good design.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Glaister

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR