
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2016

by Rachel Walmsley BSc MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/16/3157393
112 Acre Lane, Lambeth, London SW2 5RA

- 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 J Woolford against the decision of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 16/00957/FUL, dated 16 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is construction of second floor rear extension over existing 2 storey rear addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and neighbouring properties.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a three storey mid-terrace property with a ground floor rear extension and a part two storey rear projection. The two storey rear projection in particular is a feature which is evident on other properties within the terraced row of houses. The rear projections share a symmetry to create a pattern of rear projections. Whilst views of the rear elevations are at times obscured, the elevations can be seen from Ballater Road and from the pocket park off Corrance Road.
4. Policy Q11 of the Local Plan¹ emphasises the importance of subordination and seeks development that does not dominate or overwhelm the host building. This is reinforced in the Council's SPD² which refers specifically to rear returns and requires them to be characteristic of the building type and locality and to be subordinate.
5. The proposal would add appreciably to the bulk and mass of the existing rear projection and therefore would create a rear projection that would over-dominate the rear elevation of the existing property. The need to raise the existing cill level of a window at second floor level to accommodate the development is testament of the proposal being inappropriate in scale for the

¹ Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015)

² Lambeth, Building Alterations & Extensions, Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (September 2015)

- host dwelling. The scale of the development, therefore, would appear overbearing and incongruous in character, out of keeping with the form and character of the host dwelling.
6. The development would extend above the height of the ridge lines of existing rear projections, upsetting the symmetry to the rear of the properties and appearing as an anomaly within the row of houses, detracting from their scale and character. The architectural merit of the rear elevations within the terraced row has been compromised by successive additions and alterations. However, the rear projections, particularly at first floor level, remain a defining feature of the houses and in light of my findings, the development would detract from this. Furthermore, the smaller sized window proposed at second floor level and within the extension itself would appear incongruous, out of keeping with the size and design of the larger windows seen on the rear elevations of existing houses within the row.
 7. I appreciate that the development would not be visible from the street frontage and views at the rear would be limited. However, the development would be seen from the pocket park off Corrance Road and in particular from Ballater Road. From here the proposal would appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling and out of keeping with the character of the row of terraced houses.
 8. I have noted the appellant's reference to an appeal³ at 120 Acre Lane for a similar development and which was allowed. The appeal was considered against the policies of the London Borough of Lambeth Unitary Development Plan (2007) and the Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Alterations and Extensions (2008). I do not have copies of the drawings relating to this development to draw comparisons with the current proposal. However, the appeal was decided against policies that have since been superseded by the more recent Local Plan and SPD referenced above. This is a material difference between the two development proposals and therefore I can give little weight to the appeal decision before me.
 9. I have no doubt that the extension would enhance the existing property and provide improved internal living spaces. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the form and scale of the development as proposed is imperative to realise the benefits identified. As such the benefits would not overcome the harm that I have found to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and neighbouring properties. In all, therefore, I find that the development would be harmful to the scale and form of the host dwelling and the other houses within the terraced row. As such the development would be contrary to policy Q11 of the Local Plan and the SPD.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the development would be contrary to the development plan and therefore the appeal is dismissed.

R Walmsley INSPECTOR

³ APP/N5660/A/11/2160327