



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2022

by Ryan Cowley MPlan (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16/01/2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/22/3302978

105 Landells Road, London SE22 9PH

- 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 Adam Harvey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 21/AP/3710, dated 15 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is construction of a mansard roof extension, floor plan redesign and all associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a mansard roof extension, floor plan redesign and all associated works at 105 Landells Road, London SE22 9PH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/AP/3710, dated 15 October 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:

Site Location Plan (Plotted Scale – 1:1,250)

Proposed Ground Floor Plan (66395 – 3100 - 2, Rev C)

Proposed First and Loft Floor Plan (66395 – 3101 - 2, Rev C)

Proposed Roof Plan (66395 – 3102 - 2, Rev C)

Proposed Front and Right Side Elevations (66395 – 3200 - 2, Rev C)

Proposed Rear and Left Side Elevations (66395 – 3201 - 2, Rev C)

Proposed Section A-A (66395 – 3300 - 2, Rev C)

- 3) The construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the facing materials to be used have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the banner heading, I have referred to the description of the development from the Council's decision notice, as this is more precise than that contained within the application form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey end of terrace dwelling on Landells Road. This street is predominantly lined by two storey traditional terraced dwellings with pitched roofs and a uniform appearance. Many appear to have accommodation within the roof space, and some feature dormer window extensions to the rear. It is therefore not uncommon for dwellings in this area to be extended at roof level, though the impact of this on the street scene along Landells Road has been limited. The street sits on a modest slope, with dwellings gradually stepping down in level from south to north.
5. The appeal property is one of a set of four similar corner buildings that sit at the junction of Goodrich Road and Landells Road and are distinct from their attached neighbours. They feature chamfered corners and flat or butterfly roof forms typically concealed behind a parapet. These dwellings bookend their respective terraces on either side of Landells Road. There are doors and windows on both public facing elevations, which positively responds to the perpendicular street layout. They otherwise share many of the same features and finishing materials of neighbouring dwellings in the terrace.
6. I recognise there is symmetry in the form and appearance of the four corner buildings at this junction, particularly between the appeal property and 107 Landells Road. This symmetry is primarily appreciated in views looking northwest along Goodrich Road. There are however subtle differences between these two. These include differences in levels relative to their attached neighbours, the size of chimneys on the party wall, the detailing of side facing windows, the finish and roof form of the front facing bay windows, the detailing of the parapet on the chamfered corner, and the extent to which this wraps around the building. The similarities between the appeal site and the other two corner properties are less pronounced, with an even greater variation in finishing materials, the composition of doors and windows, and roof forms.
7. The appeal proposal would add an additional level to the existing dwelling, albeit in the form of a modest mansard roof extension. This would sit behind the existing parapet. The prevailing design features of the host dwelling described above, which it shares with its opposite neighbours and add a uniqueness to the local townscape, would otherwise largely be retained. It is common ground between the parties that, viewed in isolation at least, the proposed extension would appear subservient, respecting the architectural hierarchy of the property, and would be finished in appropriate materials.
8. Additionally, within the setting of Nos 105 and 107, are a collection of 3 storey buildings framing the adjacent junction. These taller neighbouring buildings include various forms of pitched roof. Looking northwest along Goodrich Road, they sit behind Nos 105 and 107 and, in more distant views, extend above the existing parapets and would form the backdrop of the proposed extension.
9. In the above context, I conclude that the proposal would not look unduly discordant or significantly unbalance the relationship between the appeal property, No 107 and the other corner buildings opposite. Furthermore, I do

not consider that it would significantly detract from the unique and locally distinctive townscape in this area.

10. I therefore find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It is in accordance with Policies P13 and P14 of The Southwark Plan 2019-2036 (February 2022) and Policy D4 of the London Plan (March 2021). These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure development is of a high standard of design, and responds positively to the existing townscape, character and context.
11. The proposal also complies with Section 3.4 of the 2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards (2011) Supplementary Planning Document, which, amongst other things, indicates that extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building and the character of the area. I have found no conflict with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, in respect of achieving well-designed places.

Conditions

12. The Council have suggested conditions should the appeal be successful. I have considered these and amended where necessary in light of the national Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to specify the approved plans as this provides certainty. Furthermore, external materials need to be approved in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

Ryan Cowley

INSPECTOR