
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2025

by **P Burley BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/W/25/3367215

Flat 26, Beechwoods Court, 3 Crystal Palace Parade, London SE19 1UH

- 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 Syed Wajahat Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref is 25/AP/0554.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retention of polycarbonate sheeting over the extension to the front of the building'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On my site visit I observed that the appeal scheme had been constructed and that it appears to accord with the plans before me. Therefore, I have considered the appeal on the basis that the development has already taken place.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the appeal scheme on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area; and
 - whether fire safety considerations have been adequately addressed.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is a ground floor dwelling in a four-storey purpose-built block of flats. The block of flats is at a lower level than the adjacent public highway (Crystal Palace Parade) such that pedestrians on the pavement of Crystal Palace Parade are at a similar height to the windows of the first floor flats.
5. The appeal scheme consists of two areas of clear polycarbonate panelling and associated timber frames which cover parts of a walled-in outdoor area that adjoins a ground floor flat. There are vertical panels of polycarbonate between the largest area of roofing and the top of the wall.
6. The relationship between the appeal site and the public highway makes the appeal scheme particularly visible. When seen from Crystal Palace Parade it is clearly

apparent that the rudimentary design and materials that have been used are at odds with and negatively affect the appearance of the host building and its surroundings.

7. Accordingly, I consider that the appeal scheme does not represent good design and is harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. Therefore, the appeal scheme is contrary to Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021 (LP) and Policies P13, P14 and P15 of the Southwark Plan 2022, all of which seek to achieve good design in developments.

Fire Risk

8. The Council's officer report says that LP Policy D12 requires the submission of a planning fire safety strategy in association with all proposals for development and that the document submitted by the appellant is not acceptable. However, LP Policy D12 only requires a fire statement to be submitted in relation to major development and the appeal scheme is not major development.
9. The officer report then concludes that it has not been adequately demonstrated that the materials used in the construction of the appeal scheme would not pose an undue fire risk to the host property or attached flats and that the appeal scheme is, therefore, contrary to LP Policy D12 A. Neither LP Policy D12 A nor the supporting text to that policy explicitly state that the risk of fire associated with construction materials is a matter to be taken into account in making planning decisions. In any event, the materials used appear to be standard construction materials and are very modest in scale such that there is no evidence that they would cause a significant risk of fire spread.
10. Therefore, I do not identify any conflict with LP Policy D12.

Conclusion

11. The lack of conflict with policy in terms of fire risk is a neutral matter in the overall consideration of this appeal. I consider that the appeal scheme is harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area and, as such, I consider that it conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole.
12. For the reason given above the appeal should be dismissed.

P Burley

INSPECTOR