
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/16/3154338

Flat C, 12 Atherfold Road, London SW9 9LW

- 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 Mrs Faye Reynolds against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 16/02264/FUL, dated 13 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft extension over the main roof in the form of a mansard dormer and new terrace over existing rear addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 second floor flat in a 3 storey mid terraced building located on the western side of Atherfold Road. The proposed development would create a mansard on the rear roof slope and a terrace over the rear addition.
 4. Policy Q11(o) of the Lambeth Local Plan (LP) states that roof terraces will normally be resisted on locally distinct building types where they are not characteristic of the host building/group. Whilst there are some examples of roof terraces in the wider area, both the Council and the appellant acknowledge that there are no other roof terraces along the rear of this part of Atherfold Road.
 5. LP Policy Q2(ii) states that development will be supported if acceptable standards of privacy are provided without a diminution of the design quality. It is proposed to erect a 1.7m high obscure glazed screen around the perimeter of the roof terrace. This screen would prevent those using the terrace from overlooking neighbouring properties. However, it would be a substantial addition to the roof, and its materials would appear in stark contrast to the traditional brick rear elevations of the terrace.
-

6. The appellant has suggested alternative materials such as painted iron railings could be used if required, although it is acknowledged that a secondary screening would be necessary in order to maintain privacy. However, the height and extent of any privacy screening around the proposed roof terrace would be likely to appear as a prominent and incongruous feature above the rear addition.
7. The form and materials of the proposed mansard would comply in many respects with the detailed guidance set out in the Lambeth Supplementary Planning Document: Building Alterations and Extensions (SPD). However, in order to access the proposed roof terrace, a door is proposed in a dormer which would cut across the face of both the main rear elevation of the appeal property and the mansard.
8. At paragraph 4.20g, the SPD states that dormers should not project forward of the roof below eave level which should be at 1m above floor level. This planning guidance is a material consideration of relevance to the proposed development. The proposed dormer would not accord with the guidance in the SPD, since it would project forward of the roof and cut across the eaves line.
9. The existing rear addition is subordinate to the main terrace, being flat roofed and terminating below eaves level. The proposed introduction of a door within a dormer in this high level location would create a discordant feature at odds with the architectural composition and rhythm of this part of the terrace.
10. Although the proposed development would be located to the rear of the building, and would not be visible from the public realm, it would nevertheless be seen from the back gardens of neighbouring properties on Atherfold Road. The lack of public views is no basis for allowing the appeal proposal given the harm it would cause to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.
11. My attention has been drawn to other examples of roof extensions and roof terraces in the surrounding area. I do not have full details of the planning history of these schemes or the site circumstances, and so cannot make direct comparisons with the appeal proposal before me. However, in the case of 54 Hemberton Road and 16 Tregothnan Road, I note that the applications pre-dated the current development plan. With regard to the scheme at 34 Hemberton Road, I note that this was an application for a lawful development certificate rather than planning permission, and so would not have been assessed against development plan policy. In any event, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and the appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to the design aims of LP Policies Q2, Q5, Q8 and Q11, and would fail to accord with SPD guidance relating to roof alterations and extensions.

Conclusion

13. I have had regard to the benefit of providing additional living accommodation within the appeal property. However, I note that this could be achieved through the implementation of an alternative scheme for which planning permission has been granted. I have also had regard to the benefit of

providing external amenity space for the appeal property, but do not consider that would outweigh the harm I have identified.

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

C L Humphrey

INSPECTOR