
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2016

by C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/16/3156105
2 Spenser Road, London SE24 0NR

- 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 Sorrel Roberts against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 16/01906/FUL, dated 24 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension to accommodate a kitchen and dining area; new front window to match existing to proposed playroom; small frontwards extension to the existing lean to at the side to accommodate a new shower room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension to accommodate a kitchen and dining area; new front window to match existing to proposed playroom; small frontwards extension to the existing lean to at the side to accommodate a new shower room at 2 Spenser Road, London SE24 0NR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01906/FUL, dated 24 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P00A, P01A, P02, P03, P04A, P06, P10A, P11A, P12, P13A, P14A, P15A and P16.
 - 3) Notwithstanding Condition 2, prior to the commencement of any superstructure works on site, details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces and fenestration of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and samples.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.
-

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a ground floor flat within a substantial detached double fronted property located on the east side of Spenser Road. The appeal site lies within Poet's Corner Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).
4. The Conservation Area is characterised by mid – late 19th Century residential development. Despite a diverse mix of house types, storey heights and detailed designs, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is unified by the consistent front building lines set behind mature front gardens within a regular layout of long straight tree lined streets. The use of a limited palette of materials and the repetition of design elements such as bay windows and fenestration with a vertical emphasis also provides visual cohesion.
5. The proposed rear extension would be a fairly modest single storey addition to the appeal property. Although the extension would wrap around the south-east corner of the main building, the staggered arrangement of the proposed rear elevation would echo that of the main building and side wing. The extension would not span the full width of the side wing. Use of a flat roof and low profile roof light would minimise the height and bulk of the proposed development.
6. The proposed bricks to be used in the construction of the single storey rear extension would match the existing building. The insertion of large glazed doors would create a fairly lightweight appearance. These doors would be positioned in alignment with the existing first floor window above, thereby achieving balance within the rear elevation. The proposed kitchen window would be similar in proportion to the existing kitchen window on the side wing.
7. The submitted plans indicate that the windows and doors within the proposed rear extension would be powder coated aluminium. As such, they would not reflect the existing predominantly timber framed fenestration and would thus not respect or reinforce the established positive characteristics of the appeal property. However, the appellant has indicated that they would be prepared to accept a condition relating to the submission of details of the materials to be used for the proposed fenestration, which would satisfactorily address this matter.
8. Overall, due to its siting, scale, and design, the proposed single storey rear extension would not unacceptably dominate or overwhelm the host building, and would respond positively to the original architecture, detailing and fenestration of the appeal property.
9. The appeal proposal also involves the insertion of a new front window to match the existing, and a small frontwards extension to the existing lean to at the side of the appeal property. The Council's delegated report states that these minor works are acceptable as they would not harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I agree with this assessment.
10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. Furthermore, for the same reasons, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Poet's Corner Conservation Area.
11. As such, the proposed development would accord with the visual amenity, design and heritage conservation and enhancement aims of the Lambeth Local

Plan (LP) Policies Q2, Q11 and Q22. The development would also accord with the design principles for extensions set out in the Lambeth Supplementary Planning Document Building Alterations and Extensions in that it would be physically subordinate and would not dominate the host building or overwhelm its form or composition.

12. Although the Council's delegated report repeatedly makes reference to LP Policy Q22, which relates to conservation areas, the reason for refusal instead cites LP Policy Q20, which relates to listed buildings. The Council's delegated report confirms that the appeal property is not a listed building. As such, I do not consider LP Policy Q20 is directly relevant to the appeal proposal and therefore afford it very little weight.

Conditions

13. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. In order to ensure the suitable appearance of the development, I have imposed a condition relating to materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces and fenestration.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C L Humphrey

INSPECTOR