

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2017

by G J Fort BA PGDip LLM MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 05 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/16/3162799

25A Hawarden Grove, Lambeth, London SE24 9DQ

- 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 Reuben Wiseman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 16/02318/FUL, dated 14 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a main roof rear mansard with dormer window and installation of roof lights to facilitate a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a main roof rear mansard with dormer window and installation of roof lights to facilitate a loft conversion at 25A Hawarden Grove, Lambeth, London SE24 9DQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/02318/FUL, dated 14 April 2016, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted relates to the following approved plans: OS Map; Existing & Proposed First & Second Floor Plans Dwg No. 001; Proposed Loft & Structural Floor Plans Dwg No. 002 -Revision A Existing & Proposed Elevations Dwg No. 003-Revision B; Proposed Section Dwg No. 004-Revision C; Existing & Proposed Roof Plans Dwg No 005- Revision B.

Procedural Matter

2. Whilst the application form indicates that building work had not started at the time of its submission, I saw that the alterations outlined in the description of development above had been implemented at the time of my site visit. As a consequence, I have treated this appeal as relating to a retrospective application for planning permission.

Main Issues

3. I consider the main issues to be the effects of the appeal development on its host building and surroundings.

Reasons

4. Mid-terraced and of two-storeys, the appeal building is in a predominantly residential street. To the rear of the appeal building, a large two-and-a-half-storey pitched-roofed outrigger of considerable depth projects from the main
-

rear elevation and roof-slope of the building. A prominent party wall runs proud of the ridge of this outrigger, marking the boundary with the neighbouring property. These outriggers are a dominant presence along the rear of the terrace, imparting a sense of rhythm to this aspect.

5. The appeal scheme has introduced a mansard-style extension to the rear aspect of the roof, set down from the roof ridges of the street facing element of the appeal building and its outrigger, with a dormer window extending from its rear roof pitch. The party wall between No 23 and the appeal building has been built up with matching bricks to provide a flank wall for the mansard. Bi-fold doors with a protective guard-rail are included at the first floor of the rear outrigger, replacing an existing pair of rear windows. At the front, the appeal development has introduced three roof-lights.
6. Whilst the appeal development has extended over part of the outrigger's roof, it has only done so to a limited depth, and to a scale considerably lower than the prominent party wall that runs along its ridge. As a result, the appeal development reads as a subservient addition that does not interfere unduly with the prominence of the outrigger, or undermine the rhythm of the wider terrace.
7. Elsewhere within the terrace I saw other roof extensions, although in some cases of more excessive proportions, and of less sensitive detailing than the appeal scheme. As a consequence, the more subservient and sensitive roof alteration at the appeal property does not read as an uncharacteristic form of development. Accordingly, these considerations lead me to the view that the appeal development is not an incongruous addition, and does not diminish the design integrity either of its host dwelling or its adjoining properties.
8. The appeal development has thus caused no significant harm to the character and appearance of its host building and surroundings, and as a consequence does not conflict with Policies Q5 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (adopted September 2015). Taken together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that roof alterations and mansards sustain local distinctiveness, are subservient to their host buildings and do not harm the architectural integrity of the original building and its group.
9. As the appeal development is subservient to its host building I can find no conflict with paragraph 4.19 of the Council's Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (adopted September 2015) insofar as it suggests that, in order to ensure subordination, roof alterations that extend over rear returns should generally be resisted. Furthermore, as I have found that the appeal development has caused no harmful effects to the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings it does not set a precedent for other developments which would cause harm in these respects. In any event, each proposal needs to be considered on its own planning merits.

Other Matter

10. The bi-fold doors and safety railings replace an existing pair of large windows. As a consequence, they would not have a materially greater effect on the privacy of the occupiers of adjacent properties than the former arrangement. Moreover, as the bi-fold doors serve a residential use in a predominantly residential area, I consider that they would not give rise to a level of noise and

disturbance that would be of material harm to the occupants of adjoining dwellings.

Conditions

11. I have been supplied with a list of suggested conditions by the Council and have assessed these against the tests given in paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This states that planning conditions should only be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. In the interests of certainty, I have attached a condition specifying the approved plans, although in an amended form of wording to that suggested by the Council to reflect the retrospective nature of the appeal scheme. As the development has already been completed in materials that match those of the host building, it is unnecessary either to attach conditions relating to the timing of implementation or requiring the use of matching materials.

Conclusion

12. The appeal development would not conflict with the development plan insofar as the policies that have been drawn to my attention are concerned. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

G J Fort

INSPECTOR