

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2016

**by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 15 November 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/16/3158496**  
**2 Archbishop's Place, London SW2 2AJ**

- 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 Megan Pearce against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
  - The application Ref 16/03939/FUL, dated 1 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2016.
  - The development proposed is the enlargement of rear ground floor projection and installation of rear facing dormer.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the enlargement of rear ground floor projection and installation of rear facing dormer at 2 Archbishop's Place, London SW2 2AJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/03939/FUL, dated 1 July 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: '01/01'; '01/03'; '01/04'; '01/05'; '01/06'; and '01/07'.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

### Main Issue

2. The first main issue is whether the proposals would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Rush Common Conservation Area (CA).

### Reasons

3. Archbishops Place is a residential street close to a range of other uses, comprising mainly mid Victorian close-knit terraces and semi-detached properties. It is a quiet area with a traditional leafy feel away from the hustle and bustle of the busier urban area to the west. The site is close to the junction with Somers Road. The adjacent buildings that front onto Somers Road have their rear elevations alongside the site providing a highly enclosed rear garden.
-

4. The rear garden currently consists of a small courtyard to the side and rear of an existing 2 storey rear projection. This projection has a pitched roof which is mirrored on the adjoining dwelling within the semi-detached pair. A further area of garden is at a much higher level towards the rear of the site, enclosed by substantial boundary fences.
5. The proposed ground floor extension would wrap around the rear projection although would be set in slightly from the side wall of the main part of the house. This would be low down and the upper part of the rear projection would remain unaltered. That would remain the main part of the dwelling noticeable from the gardens to the south east. The extension would have a long flat roof and a large folding glazed door would dominate the end elevation in a very secluded position. The modern design would contrast with the traditional qualities of the existing dwelling. Any increase in horizontal emphasis in built form would not dominate the structure and would not be prominent.
6. A dormer is proposed that would be positioned centrally within the rear roof slope. This would look balanced and a good amount of the sloping roof would be retained. The construction details would be refined with a simple elegance, more so than other roof dormers nearby. It would be set down substantially from the ridge of the dwelling and the cheeks of the structure would not protrude prominently above the party wall between this roof and that of the adjoining dwelling. On the other side, the side of the dormer would be very well screened by the 3 storey building on the corner of Somers Road.
7. The dormer would not be aligned with the windows below as recommended within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document<sup>1</sup> (SPD). However this is a single fronted, narrow dwelling where the front elevation has 2 windows centrally, 1 above the other. The rear elevation is dominated by the 2 storey projection and there is no clear symmetry to the window alignment. A centrally placed dormer as proposed is more appropriate in my opinion.
8. The proposals would respect and reinforce the established positive, distinctive characteristics of the area. In relation to the first main issue the proposals would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. This would comply with Policies Q5, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan<sup>2</sup>.

### **Other Matters**

9. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty that the development will be implemented as proposed. The only other necessary condition in addition to this and the standard time limit, requires that the materials used match the existing building.

### **Conclusion**

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

*A Harwood*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Building Alterations and Extensions, Supplementary Planning Document, September 2015

<sup>2</sup> Lambeth Local Plan, adopted September 2015