



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022 by Ms S Maur

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/21/3284733

Site Address: 69 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 Anna Henry against the decision of the London Borough of Southwark Council.
 - The application Ref 21/AP/1839, dated 26 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is to convert the existing butterfly roof into a habitable space.
-

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 development 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.69, is a mid-terraced two storey Victorian dwelling, located on the east side of Maxted Road, within a predominantly residential area. 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 outriggers to the rear are lower in height.
6. The proposal consists of the construction of a mansard style roof extension which would incorporate 2 rooflights in the front roof slope and slate style

- hanging tiles and a glass barrier at the rear. It would replace the existing butterfly roof.
7. 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.
 8. Number 69 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 form that would significantly alter both the height and proportions of the building and be at odds with the 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.
 9. 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 evidence in respect of views from Maxted Road is limited and I am not convinced the roof alterations would be fully obscured by the existing parapet. Although the nearby property, No.75 is a storey higher with a greater depth, this would not fully obscure views from Nutbrook Street. In addition, the existing street tree would not provide substantive screening when not in leaf and there is no guarantee that it would remain in the long term.
 10. The effort to minimise visual impact through the use of sympathetic materials as well as retain roofscape features such as chimney stacks and pots is noted. However, these matters would not mitigate or outweigh the harm that would arise which would primarily derive from the altered roof form.
 11. My attention has been drawn to examples of loft conversions on Waghorn Street. This road is of a differing character and full details of these schemes have not been provided. There are examples of butterfly roof conversions elsewhere on Maxted Road. However, I do not have the full details of the reasoning as to why the Council found these schemes acceptable, before me and I cannot therefore know whether the circumstances of these cases are directly comparable. 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. 69 is located is separated from these dwellings by some distance, by side roads and a block of flats which in turn creates a distinction between each section of the street scene. Accordingly, I have considered this appeal scheme on its own site specific circumstances.
 12. For the reasons detailed above, the roof extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, the development would not comply with Policy 3.12 and Policy 3.13 of the Southwark Plan (2007), which together seek high quality architectural and urban design that is appropriate to the local context to enhance the quality of the built environment and does not dominate its surroundings by giving consideration of the height, scale and massing of surrounding buildings.

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. There would be benefits of extra space in the property to allow for elderly parents to potentially move in and to allow them to remain in this area as well as an extra space for home working. However, these would be private benefits, as such these only carry limited weight and would not outweigh the harm identified.
15. I have noted and taken account of the concerns raised about the handling of the application in terms of communication and engagement processes. However, these matters are not fundamental to the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR