



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by **T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/25/3367941**

**8 Goodwin Close, Southwark, London SE16 3TR**

- 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 Chandrasekaran against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
  - The application Ref is 25/AP/0552.
  - The development proposed is erection of garden room.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and whether the development would provide acceptable living conditions for the existing occupiers of 9 Goodwin Close (No 9) with particular regard to outlook.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal property is a two-storey mid-terraced house with rear dormer. The proposed garden room would be located in the rear garden, with limited visibility of it from public vantage points. However, it would be highly visible in private views from surrounding properties.
4. On my site visit, I observed that many neighbouring gardens contained outbuildings of varying sizes and designs. However, these were typically small, pitched roof structures, modest in length and width, and none were as large as the proposed building. This is in sharp contrast to the proposed garden room, which would be a tall, deep, flat roofed structure spanning almost the full width of the garden, occupying a substantial proportion of it, with a footprint not dissimilar to the host property itself.
5. Although the building would be finished in appropriate external materials, its overall size and scale would be out of proportion with what is a modest terraced dwelling, it would therefore appear as a disproportionate and overly dominant addition to the rear garden, harmfully at odds with the character and appearance of surrounding gardens.

6. For the above reasons I find that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy P13 of the Southwark Local Plan (2022) which seeks to ensure, amongst other matters, that the scale of development responds positively to the existing townscape, character and context.

### *Living conditions*

7. No 9 Goodwin Close is an end-terraced property with an access road adjacent to the flank elevation and a small carpark to the rear. This provides a more open outlook from the rear of this property compared to others in the terrace. The front elevation of No 9 is set further back from other properties in the terrace and so it has a shallow garden, but one that is wider than neighbouring properties, with the western boundary tapering away from the rear elevation.
8. The proposed garden room's height, close proximity and its side elevation extending along an appreciable length of the shared boundary fence would make it visible from No 9. However, considering its flat-roof design, its set back from the area closest to the rear elevation and adjacent patio area of No 9, where the occupiers would likely spend a large proportion of their time, and the end-terrace location of No 9 with the outlook along the southern and western boundaries remaining unaffected, I consider that the garden room would not result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure and would not harmfully impact the outlook of the occupiers of No 9 when using their outdoor amenity space.
9. For the reasons above, the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for the occupiers of No 9, according with Policy P56 of the Southwark Local Plan (2022). This seeks to ensure development does not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to present or future occupiers.

### **Other Matters**

10. It is suggested that the outbuilding is needed to provide additional ground-floor living space for a family member as well as office and storage space. There is not however any compelling evidence before me to indicate that a more appropriately scaled building could not provide such facilities.
11. Whilst the appellant asserts that the outbuilding would qualify as permitted development, it is not for me to determine under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act), whether the proposal would be permitted development. In any case, the Council state that the property does not benefit from permitted development rights. This is therefore not a consideration which weighs in favour of the proposal.
12. The presence of the rear extension at No 3 Goodwin Close does not alter my findings as this is not an outbuilding and is of limited depth.
13. I note a positive indication was given from the planning officer on site. However, they are not bound by these comments. The officer report and decision notice clearly articulate the Council's concerns.
14. A lack of objections from the building design team does not alter my findings with regards to the harm identified, which has been assessed on its planning merits.

## **Conclusion**

15. Whilst I have found that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers, this does not outweigh the harm arising to the character and appearance of the area.
16. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

*T Bennett*

INSPECTOR