



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022 by Ms S Maur

Decision by S. Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/21/3285577

Site Address: 73 Maxted Road, London SE15 4LF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Rebecca and Adrian Evanson and Cousins against the decision of the London Borough of Southwark Council.
 - The application Ref 21/AP/2557, dated 19 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension to terraced house with a London (also known as Butterfly) roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer 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 the effect of the proposed roof extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Development along Maxted Road is set out in a linear pattern. Properties are generally two storey terraced houses, with defining features such as regularly positioned and detailed fenestration and consistent eaves or parapet lines which provide a rhythm to the street scene. The facades are generally finished in a light tone London Stock Brick with red brick banding and lintels and white decorative mouldings, the consistent use of which adds to the harmonious appearance of the area.
5. The appeal dwelling, No 73, is a two-storey property situated within a terrace. It has a similar architectural style and form to the other properties in the row and as such contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. The property, like its neighbours, has a butterfly roof concealed by a parapet to the front and contrasts with the design of properties opposite. The outrigger to the rear is lower in height.
6. The host dwelling is located towards the end of Maxted Road, with only one dwelling sited between it and the corner of the road junction. The property on the corner, No.75 is a 3-storey property that has a greater depth and a

- different architectural form, including a different roof form, and design to other properties in the row.
7. The proposal consists of the construction of a mansard style roof extension with a grey metal standing seam pitched roof with rooflights, to replace the existing butterfly roof, incorporating a small roof terrace built into the roof profile.
 8. The 2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (SPD), advises that extensions should harmonise with the character of the area, integrate with their surroundings, retain existing features and contribute to the architectural integrity and proportions of a group of buildings. Specifically, the SPD states that roof extensions will not be permitted where there is an unbroken run of butterfly roofs.
 9. There is no dispute between the parties that the roof of No 73 is one of an unbroken run of butterfly roofs. Although the proposal would retain a V shaped parapet to the rear, the proposal would result in the loss of what is a characteristic feature of the area. Moreover, the roof would have a substantial asymmetric pitched form that would significantly alter both the height and proportions of the building and be at odds with architectural character of this dwelling and others in the run. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to the requirements of the SPD as set out above.
 10. In addition, the SPD also specifies that roof extensions will not be permitted where the roofline is exposed to long views from public spaces and the proposal would impact the view. The appellant opines that the proposed development would cause little to no impact to Maxted Road as the roof form would be pitched and would be obscured by the existing parapet. However, the evidence provided in this respect is limited, with the suggested sightlines being limited to one viewpoint on Maxted Road only. Without evidence to the contrary, even though I recognise that No 75 is taller than the appeal property, I am unconvinced that the structure would not be visible from viewpoints along Maxted Road and potentially from Nutbrook Street.
 11. My attention has been drawn to two examples of extensions with pitched roofs behind parapets on Maxted Road, which I am informed are of a similar height, material and setback from the rear elevation as well as being designed by the same architect. However, I do not have the full details as to why the Council found these schemes acceptable and I cannot therefore know whether the circumstances of these cases are directly comparable to that before me. Notwithstanding that, Maxted Road is a long road and this type of roof extension is not predominant and nor does it reflect the prevailing character of the buildings. In addition, the run in which No 73 is located is separated from these dwellings by a distance, by side roads and a block of flats which creates a distinction between each section of the street scene. As set out above the appeal site lies in a row where there is an unbroken run of similar roofs, which the SPD seeks to preserve.
 12. For the reasons detailed above, the roof extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not meet the criteria of Policy 3.13 of the Saved Southwark Plan (2007) which requires proposals to be appropriate to the local context and make a positive contribution to the

character by considering the height, scale and massing of existing buildings and not dominate its surroundings.

13. There would also be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to achieve good design and reflect the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

14. While there have been no neighbour objections, I must consider the effect of this proposal on the character and appearance of the area. Even though the Council's report found the proposed materials to be acceptable, noting that the design would be an interesting compliment to the period property, this would not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, there are no material circumstances which would indicate that the proposal should be granted contrary to the requirements of adopted policy. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR