



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2024 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/W/24/3345985

125 Bellenden Road, Southwark, London SE15 4QY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ahmet Kafesci against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref is 24/AP/0182.
 - The development proposed is roof extension to form extra bedroom to existing self contained flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector 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 whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Holly Grove Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. 125 Bellenden Road (No 125) is a mid-terraced, three-storey building located in the Holly Grove CA. The significance of the CA derives from it being one of the oldest parts of the original hamlet of Peckham and its growth as a planned suburban development in the 19th century (C19) with residential streets of a distinctive character. Most of the CA was constructed between the early C19 and early C20, using a relatively limited range of materials to classical and, later, revivalist architectural styles. The Council's Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) identifies Bellenden Road as being located in a sub area of the CA which has a distinctive townscape. The CAA describes the south part of Bellenden Road as 'having acquired the role of a main traffic spine through the area' and being an 'important seam between the key areas of Holly Grove and Lyndhurst Way'.
5. The appeal property is part of a wider terrace with shop fronts at ground floor level. The upper floors of the terrace have a uniform appearance due to their unbroken roofline with butterfly roof forms obscured by a parapet fronting the street, their London brickwork with red brick banding, and their evenly

proportioned upper floor windows which have a repeated arch detail above them. The consistency of the architecture gives the terrace a pleasing cohesive appearance and Figure 22 of the CAA identifies the building as making a positive contribution to the CA.

6. The appellant contends that the proposal would not be visible in the street scene. However, this appears to be based on views to the more immediate frontage of the building as depicted in the photographs under '1 Visibility of the Development' within the appellant's appeal statement. Furthermore, the existing 'Section CC' drawing depicts a wall extending the full depth of the main roof, protruding significantly above the height of the parapet, at a similar height to the proposal. However, from my own observations on the street, chimneys are the only noticeable structures protruding above the parapet roofline on the three-storey section of the terrace. These chimneys are also set well back from the front parapet. This is evident from further along Bellenden Road in views towards the terrace from both directions.
7. As the mansard form of the extension would extend very close to the front parapet to a similar height to the chimneys, it would be a bulky addition that would appear significantly at odds with the otherwise lower profile of the roof of the wider terrace. This would likely be very noticeable in the identified views from further along Bellenden Road and there is no detailed evidence before me to demonstrate otherwise. In these views, the use of traditional materials would not be sufficient to assimilate the form of the extension into the roofscape of the terrace. The proposal would therefore be an incongruous addition to the building, detracting from the consistency of the terrace and the positive contribution that it makes to the CA.
8. I have considered the examples of roof extensions in the area provided by the appellant. However, the detailed planning history for the respective buildings is not before me and so I am not aware of the material planning considerations for each case. In any case they do not relate to the terrace that the appeal site sits within which, for the reasons described, has a uniform appearance that adds to the significance of the CA.
9. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA.
10. In accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. In this regard, the proposal would provide additional living space for the appellant's family. The appellant suggests this would support their personal circumstances in terms of their continued residence at the property in association with their business. I recognise the strategic visions of Southwark Council to support housing and commercial activity in the area. However, the site-specific considerations put forward amount to no more than a modest public benefit and are not sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm identified and the great weight I apply to the CA's conservation in line with Paragraph 205 of the Framework.

11. I conclude, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Holly Grove CA. In this regard, it would conflict with Policies D4 (Delivering Good Design) and HC1 (Heritage Conservation and Growth) of The London Plan (2021) and Policies P13 (Design of Places), P14 (Design Quality), P20 (Conservation Areas) and P21 (Conservation of the Historic Environment and Natural Heritage) of The Southwark Plan (2022) which require that development proposals should deliver good design, preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas and should respond positively to the existing townscape character and context.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed since it would conflict with the statutory presumptions under s72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as well as the development plan.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR