
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 22 July 2016

by G J Rollings BA(Hons) MA(UD) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/16/3149577

7 Glendall Street, London, SW9 8AJ

- 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 Jonathan Harris against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 15/07156/FUL, dated 15 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2016.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a rear dormer roof extension above the existing rear annexe.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site, and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site accommodates a narrow, mid-terrace dwelling. In common with other properties in the Glendall Road cul-de-sac, the site has a small front garden and larger-rear garden, enclosed on three sides by similar terraced houses and gardens. The house is formed of a main front element facing the street along the width of the site, and a rear projecting element ('rear return'), with a two-storey height on both parts.
 4. The appeal proposal, as shown on the submitted plans, incorporates the addition of a third floor of accommodation above both parts, including a mansard-type extension incorporating two small front and rear dormer windows above the main front element, and a box extension above the second floor of the rear return. However, the Council separately approved the mansard roof extension over the main front element (Council application ref: 15/05445/FUL), which appears the same as that shown on the appeal plans. At the time of my visit, this had already been constructed. As such, I consider it reasonable to limit my consideration of the proposal to the impact of the rear return extension, including the cumulative impact of this with the previously completed roof extension, as per the description of the proposed development at the start of this letter.
 5. The side return is topped by a pitched roof, similar to others in the terrace, and in the block enclosing the rear garden. The roof of the extension would be flat.
-

Although the house has been the subject of previous extensions, the original form of the pitched roof above the rear return remains clearly visible, as on other houses in the terrace. Additionally, the previous extensions have altered the house's appearance within the terrace, with the addition of the mansard-type roof extension replacing the former butterfly-style roof. I noticed that although extensions of the type proposed are visible on other terraces in views around the area, none are readily apparent in views from the rear of the property.

6. However, the addition would increase the height of the rear return above others in the terrace. Its depth would match that of the existing first floor of the rear return, and the additional scale and massing would combine to present a bulky appearance that would draw the eye in views from the surrounding properties. I acknowledge that the proposed development would have limited visibility from within the public realm, and is not within a conservation area, but its incongruity would detract from the immediate urban design context, including the repetitive largely retained patterns in the architecture of the terraces. I acknowledge that the existing alterations have already altered the appearance of the original dwelling above the main front element, but the cumulative impact of the rear return and existing extensions is sufficient to result in significant harm to this context, and thus warrant the dismissal of this appeal. This impact would not be mitigated through measures such as sympathetic building materials or similar, as suggested by the appellant.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal site, and the surrounding dwellings. It would conflict with Lambeth Local Plan (2015) Policies Q2, Q8 and Q11, which together require development, including extensions, to be appropriate within their context, amongst other considerations. I have also taken into account the Council's adopted Building Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2015), which recommends that roof additions be well integrated with the main building.

Conclusion

8. The development would conflict with the policies of the adopted development plan for the area. As such, it does not constitute sustainable development in accordance with the definition set by the *National Planning Policy Framework*. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G J Rollings

INSPECTOR