



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2025

by G Sylvester BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/W/25/3373691

Sir Robert Peel Public House, 7 Langdale Close, London SE17 3UF

- 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 John Broderick against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref is 25/AP/1287.
 - The development proposed is for the removal of the large single front dormer and the erection of two smaller front dormers to allow for windows to the loft bedrooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have determined the appeal based on the description of development on the planning application form but have had regard to the more detailed description on the appellant's appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed front dormers on the character and appearance of the host building and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is locally listed and the entry on that list describes it as a nineteenth century Public House in the Queen Anne Revival style. The building's traditional architecture and appearance, which is mainly derived from its proportions, materials and rich detailing, including the undisrupted front slope of its pitched roof form and a prominent central Dutch gable, has sufficient heritage interest to warrant being treated as a non-designated heritage asset.
5. The appeal building stands as a distinctive counterpoint to the surrounding buildings, which comprise generally of modern, simpler buildings that are seemingly reflective of estate-type development in the twentieth century. Those nearby buildings serve to emphasise the local heritage importance of the appeal building's attractive traditional architectural style which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. The Southwark Heritage Supplementary Planning Document 2021 sets the criteria for locally listed buildings and requires the local historic environment to be taken into account in decisions on planning applications.

6. There appear to be inconsistencies between how the proposed dormers are shown on the submitted drawings. Those shown on the proposed side elevations would appear to be set closer to the roof eaves than those shown on the proposed front elevation and section AA drawings, and therefore would be larger. Despite those apparent inconsistencies, I have assessed the scheme as a whole.
7. The dormers shown on the proposed front elevation and section drawing have a simple design and would be arranged to respect the symmetry of the host building's façade. The surface area of roof slope that would be covered by the proposed dormers would be broadly proportionate to its total area. However, whilst the proposed dormers would be markedly smaller than the large front box dormer that was dismissed on appeal¹ in December 2024, they would still be relatively sizeable additions to the building's front roof slope and roughly the same width as the first-floor window openings beneath them.
8. Moreover, those proposed dormers would be sited close to the host building's roof ridge, with only a small set down from it, and well above the eaves and window openings beneath them. They would be awkwardly positioned high-up on the building's roof slope and in street level views they would fail to appear well integrated within the building's roof slope or its façade. Consequently, due to the relationship between their sizes and positions on the roof slope, the proposed dormers would harmfully erode the traditional architectural proportions and composition of the appeal building's attractive façade, which has important heritage significance as a locally listed building.
9. The proposed dormers would be set back behind the host building's central Dutch gable and constructed from appropriate materials. However, those factors do not alter my assessment that the proposed dormers would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and area. As the larger dormers shown on the proposed side elevations drawing would be similarly positioned but bulkier in scale, they would result in the same harms but to a greater degree of magnitude.
10. As a matter of principle, there is nothing in the previous Inspector's decision that precludes front dormers at the appeal property, and they considered only the larger dormer that was before them. As the proposal before me is materially different in scale and appearance to the previously dismissed appeal scheme, I find that it has limited relevance and weight to my determination of this appeal, which I have considered on its own merits.
11. For those reasons, I conclude that the appeal scheme when assessed as a whole would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and area, contrary to Policies P13, P14, P15 and P26 of The Southwark Plan 2019-2036, Adopted February 2022, insofar as they require development to achieve high standards of design that respond positively to the existing townscape, including in respect of scale, siting and arrangement, and which take into account locally listed buildings that positively contribute to local character.
12. I have not been referred to any specific paragraphs of Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework"). However, for the reasons given above, the proposed development would not be consistent with Paragraph 135 of that chapter insofar as planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history, including the

¹ APP/A5840/W/24/3346848

surrounding built environment, and Paragraph 139 which requires development not well designed to be refused.

13. Although not cited in the refusal reason, both parties have provided Policy HC1 of The London Plan 2021, which requires development to avoid harm to heritage assets. For the reasons given above, the harm to the locally listed building would bring the proposed development into conflict with that Policy.

Other Matters

14. The appeal scheme would generate some small economic benefits, largely through the construction process. I note the appellant's intention, following the previously dismissed appeal for the larger front dormer, for the appeal scheme before me to improve headroom, floor space and access to natural light and ventilation within the bedrooms, with reference to optimising site capacity of brownfield sites in Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021. However, the evidence before me does not show that the existing accommodation is substandard in those respects and the Council's delegated report raises no such concerns.
15. I am not satisfied that the appeal scheme is the only option for addressing the appellant's concerns in those respects, or that they could not be improved through an appropriately designed alternative scheme. Therefore, I attach limited weight to the social and economic benefits of the appeal proposal. For the reasons I have given above those benefits are insufficient to outweigh the proposal's harmful effects on the character and appearance of the locally listed host building, and the wider area.
16. The proposal would not affect any nationally listed buildings or conservation areas. The Council has not raised concerns over any other aspects of the proposal. Even if I were to agree, an absence of harm in respect of all other matters would not have weighed positively in favour of the appeal proposal or altered the outcome of the appeal.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole. The material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal should be dismissed.

G Sylvester

INSPECTOR