



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/25/3374541

117 Benhill Road, Southwark, London SE5 7LZ

- 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 Samuel Price against the decision of the London Borough of Southwark Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/AP/1859.
 - The development proposed is for a rear mansard roof extension over parent building, rear outrigger extension over existing outrigger, maintain pitch of front roof slope, raise ridge line by 400mm, two roof lights to front roof slope, one roof light on top surface, one roof light on outrigger and raise chimney stacks by 600mm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear mansard roof extension over parent building, rear outrigger extension over existing outrigger, maintain pitch of front roof slope, raise ridge line by 400mm, two roof lights to front roof slope, one roof light on top surface, one roof light on outrigger and raise chimney stacks by 600mm at 117 Benhill Road, Southwark, London SE5 7LZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/AP/1859, and the plans submitted with it, 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: 018-R1211 Rev 02, 018-R0103 Rev 01, 018-R0101 Rev 02, 018-R1500 Rev 00, 018-R0105 Rev 01, 018-R0104 Rev 01, 018-R1111 Rev 02, 018-R1112 Rev 02, 018-R1215 Rev 00 and 018-R0102 Rev 01.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area, with reference to the setting of the locally listed Brunswick Park.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a mid-terrace three storey house, with a raised ground floor. It is located in a street predominantly made up of similar terraced houses. The terrace of which it forms part backs onto Brunswick Park. The park has been

identified by the Council as being worthy of potential future inclusion within a Conservation Area and is considered as a locally listed park. The significance of which stems from the historic development area and park, including the buildings surrounding it.

4. As such, this results in the park being a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA), as defined by the provision of the PPG¹. Accordingly, I have considered the effect of the proposal in line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework).
5. The proposal is for an 'L' shaped dormer extension to the main rear roof slope and outrigger. This involves the raising of the roof ridge by 400mm, by extending the front roof slope at its existing angle of pitch, with the addition of two rooflights to the front roof slope. The associated chimney stacks would be raised by 600mm. The main eave line of the terrace of which the appeal dwelling forms part would remain unaltered.
6. The proposal is broadly similar to a recently approved 'L' shaped dormer extension to 145 Benhill Road (No.145)², which forms part of the same terrace as the appeal dwelling and also backs onto the park. At the time of my site visit this permission remained unimplemented. This approved extension is of very much the same form, bulk and massing as the appeal proposal and would also raise the roof ridge and chimney to the same height as the appeal proposal. Given these extensive similarities in design, size, scale, bulk massing and location, I have given the approval of this nearby extension substantial weight in my considerations.
7. Whilst it is noted by the Council that the existing roof ridge of No.145 is approximately 1 metre below the roof ridge of the property at 147 Benhill Road, This is not identified as a determining factor in the Council officer's planning report for the approval of the extension at No.145. Rather the report notes that the scale and positioning of the approved extension would result in it being subordinate to the main dwelling and that the raised ridge would be in accordance with design guidance for such extensions set out at section 3.6.5 of the Southwark Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (2025).
8. Given the significant similarities in position, design, scale and location, I see no reason to find that the same is not also true for the appeal proposal. I further find that, although the appeal dwelling is towards the other end of the terrace to No.145, the appeal proposal would be as visible from the park as that at approved at No.145 and would have a broadly similar presence the setting of the park.
9. The appeal proposal would be to a property that forms part of the close setting of the park; however, it would be to an existing rear elevation of little architectural merit and would not be of a height and scale that would lend it any undue prominence. In views across the park the proposal would be seen in conjunction with many varied buildings of differing design, height and scale and would complement rather than contrast with this existing townscape and setting, preserving the significance of its character and appearance. As such I also find that the appeal proposal would not result in a detrimental addition to the setting of the park or to its significance as an NDHA. As such, the proposal would accord with the

¹ Ref: Planning Practice Guidance: Historic Environment (2014) (as amended)

² Planning Ref: 25/AP/1594

principles of the Southwark Heritage SPD (2021) in protecting the significance of heritage assets across the Council area.

10. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the park, and would preserve the significance of the park as an NDHA. This would accord with Policies P13, P14 and P21 of the Southwark Plan 2019-2036 (2022). Collectively these policies, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development, including by extension, are of a high standard of design, respond positively to townscape character and context in their height, scale, massing and arrangement, conserving the significance of the local historic environment including NDHA's.

Conditions

11. Along with the standard condition regarding the timing of implementation, in the interests of good design I have attached conditions requiring compliance with approved plans and matching materials.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, the appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR