



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2022

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/21/3283374

34 Honor Oak Rise, London SE23 3RA

- 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 Ms L Navarro against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
 - The application Ref 21/AP/1553, dated 4 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a loft extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Southwark Plan 2019-2036 (SP) was adopted after the application was determined. The Council has provided the new relevant policies and as these are referred to on the decision notice the appellant has been able to comment on them. Accordingly, this appeal has been determined in relation to the policies in the recently adopted SP.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Honor Oak Rise Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 3-storey house that forms part of 2 linked pairs of handsome Victorian semi-detached houses. Although the appeal property was partly re-built in the 20th century and its frontage does not match that of its neighbours, the group of houses largely retain their original form and symmetry. In particular, they include decorative parapets at the front behind which there are butterfly roofs. Due to their design, symmetry and form this group of houses positively contribute to the character and appearance of the CA.
5. The proposal would comprise the erection of a roof addition to create an extra room and a bathroom, together with a roof terrace at the front. I note that due to the set back from the front elevation and the height of the parapet, the addition may not be visible from the section of Honor Oak Rise directly in front of the appeal site. However, the extension would be clearly visible from points

to the rear. Although the V shaped parapet would be retained at the rear, the proposal would result in the loss of what is a characteristic feature of the group of houses and would disrupt, and consequently harm, the form and symmetry of the group.

6. Whilst each application and appeal should be considered on its individual merits, I am conscious that, in this particular case, allowing a roof addition at the appeal property could lead to similar proposals over time on the other three houses in the group leading to further, and more substantial, harm to the symmetry of the group and appearance of the CA in the future.
7. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal fails to preserve the character and appearance for the CA. It is therefore contrary to London Plan (2021) Policies D4 and HC1 and Policy P20 of the Southwark Plan 2019-2036 (2022), the latter of which states that development relating to conservation areas will only be granted where it preserves or enhances the character or appearance.
8. There is also conflict with the aims of the 2015 Technical Update to the Council's Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2011). This 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. There would also be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which seeks to achieve good design and reflect the character and appearance of the area.
9. The appellant has referred to instances where planning permission has been granted for roof additions on buildings with butterfly roofs and has provided drawings of these schemes. The terraces of which these schemes form part do not appear to display the same level of architectural quality and symmetry as the 4 houses in Honor Oak Rise and, in any event, each proposal needs to be considered on its individual merits having regard to its particular circumstances. I therefore attribute limited weight to the past planning permissions referred to.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR