

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 August 2022

**by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 09 September 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A5840/D/22/3301122**

**79 Southwark Park Road, Southwark, London SE16 3TY**

- 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 Portables against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Southwark.
  - The application Ref 22/AP/0926, dated 8 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2022.
  - The development proposed is erection of new double pitch mansard roof extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. That on the application form adequately describes the proposal but I acknowledge that the roof extension includes dormer window features to the front and rear.

## Main Issues

3. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the property and the character and appearance of the area. The second is the effect of the proposal on the setting of the Thorburn Square Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

4. No.s 77-85 Southwark Park Road (No.s 77-85) form a cohesive terrace which incorporate butterfly roofs set behind parapet walls on the front elevations. This terrace can be distinguished from a further adjoined terrace to the west of No. 77.
5. These properties (including No. 67 Southwark Park Road) are of more limited scale and are dominated by commercial front off shoots which extend towards the edge of the pavement. Many of the properties within this westerly terrace appear to have been extended upwards through mansard roof extensions, the resulting height of these extensions being broadly similar with the parapet wall height at No.s 77-85.

6. Whilst set back slightly from the front elevation, and whilst acknowledging there are higher buildings in the immediate area, the mansard roof extension would form an uncomfortable addition which would project above the height of the terrace and spoil the current cohesive form when viewed from Southwark Park Road.
7. Further, the butterfly roof form is a strong and consistent feature to the roofslopes of the terrace which due to the front parapet walls to the front are appreciated in views from the rear. The roof form is visible in partial views from Yalding Road where it forms a strong and characteristic design feature which contributes positively to the attractive appearance of the terrace.
8. Whilst the slight setting in of the mansard roof would leave a small amount of the existing roof form, the amount that would remain would be very minimal and would mean that the butterfly roof could no longer be appreciated to any proper degree.
9. I therefore conclude on this matter that the proposal would be detrimental to the appearance of the property and the terrace as a whole. It would subsequently have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.
10. The proposal would conflict with policies P13 and P14 of The Southwark Plan (2022) (SLP) and policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) which amongst other things require good quality design and require that development must ensure that height, scale, massing and arrangement respond positively to the existing townscape, character and context.
11. The proposal would also conflict with SPD guidance<sup>1</sup> which advises that roof extensions will not be permitted where there is an unbroken run of butterfly roofs.

#### *Setting of Conservation Area*

12. The appeal site sits outside of, but immediately to the north of, the Conservation Area, which includes properties to the west of Reverdy Road. The significance of this part of the Conservation Area sits largely with the form, scale, detailing and materials of its buildings.
13. Those spanning the southern side of Southwark Park Road between Reverdy Road and Alma Grove are particularly attractive and ordered and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
14. The terrace within which the appeal property sits shares such characteristics and partly as a result of its largely united appearance makes a positive contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area.
15. The increase in height of the roof at the appeal property and the loss of cohesion to the terrace would detract from the contribution the terrace makes to the setting of the Conservation Area, therefore harming its significance.
16. This harm would be less than substantial and Paragraph 196 of the Framework<sup>2</sup> states that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The provision of increased living space at the property would form a

---

<sup>1</sup> Southwark Council 2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards (2011).

<sup>2</sup> National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

very limited public benefit. It would not outweigh the harm identified which would be visible to many in this busy location.

17. The proposal would therefore harm the setting of the Conservation Area. It would subsequently fail to accord with policies P20 and P21 of the SLP and Policy HC1 of the LP as well as SPD<sup>3</sup> guidance which amongst other things seek to protect the significance of Conservation Areas.

### **Other Matters**

18. Two appeal decisions at No. 175 Bellenden Road and No. 65B Kings Grove have been drawn to my attention along with a Council decision relating to No. 33 Kings Grove relating to mansard roof extensions.
19. I have considered these decisions, but there is nothing to indicate that the rear roof slopes at those sites have the same degree of public visibility as the appeal site. I therefore do not find these decisions directly comparable and I therefore afford them limited weight.

### **Conclusion**

20. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

*T J Burnham*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>3</sup> Southwark's Historic Environment Heritage Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) September 2021.