



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2023

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/22/3307818

145 Friern Road, Southwark, London SE22 0AZ

- 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 Mrs Coral Steele against the decision of the London Borough of the Southwark Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/AP/1688, dated 13 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is the increase the size of the existing outrigger rear dormer by extending the depth and width with materials to match existing. Re-use of existing windows and inclusion of new Juliet balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the increase in size of the existing outrigger rear dormer by extending the depth and width with materials to match existing. Re-use of existing windows and inclusion of new Juliet balcony at 145 Friern Road, Southwark, London SE22 0AZ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 22/AP/1688, dated 13 May 2022, 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: D11, D12, and D13

Preliminary Matters

2. As the description of development varies between documents submitted for the purpose of this appeal, I have used the one from the Council's decision notice as this accurately and concisely describes the proposal and has been used by the appellant for their appeal statement.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area; and

- The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers, with reference to privacy.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal dwelling is a Victorian, two storey semi-detached house, which has been the subject of a loft conversion and extensions to the main roof of the house and two storey outrigger. It is located in a street of similar properties, many of which have been the subject of rear dormer extensions.
5. The proposal would extend the existing rear flat roofed dormer outrigger extension so that it would cover much of the remaining roof. It would however be slightly set back from the outriggers side and rear elevations, with a vestigial area of roof remaining. The proposal also involves French doors with a Juliet balcony to its rear, matching those in the rear of the existing dormer extension to the main roof.
6. Whilst the proposal would result in a fully squared off profile to the outrigger, this would reflect the design and/or scale of other nearby main roof dormer and outrigger extensions. The proposals would also not extend any higher or rearward than the many early three storey outriggers evident in the local area.
7. Whilst the proposal would not reflect the original hipped roof of the outrigger, it would match that of the existing roof extensions to the appeal dwelling. Within the context of these existing surrounding outriggers and later extensions, the proposal would not appear as a bulky addition. Therefore, it would not dominate the appearance of the appeal dwelling to the extent that it would result in any significant harm to its character and appearance.
8. The proposal would also appear to reflect the scale of other roof elements and extensions in the roofscape of the local area. Within this context, the proposal would, therefore, not appear incongruous and would not result in any significant harm to its character and appearance.

Living Conditions

9. The rear elevation of the existing outrigger dormer extension has a window. The proposed French doors with Juliet balcony would provide a greater degree of overlooking than this existing window.
10. However, the additional degree of overlooking afforded by the proposal would only be of the rear parts of neighbouring gardens and not of their rear rooms. This additional degree of overlooking would be marginal, and within the extent to be expected in a developed residential area of this type.
11. For this reason, the proposal would not result in a degree of overlooking that would compromise the privacy of neighbouring residential occupiers. The proposal would not, therefore, result in any significant harm to their living conditions.

Conditions

12. I have applied the standard condition relating to the timing of implementation. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions to be attached to a

planning permission. However, I find that the proposed condition related to materials used in construction of the proposal would duplicate the terms of the planning application and the standard condition that I have applied relating to compliance with drawings in the interests of design quality. For this reason, the proposed condition is unnecessary and would not comply with paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Conclusion

13. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR