
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2017

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/17/3166944

6 William Brown Court, Norwood Road, London SE27 9DD

- 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 Lambinon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 16/03399/FUL, dated 28 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is to erect a PVCU conservatory to the rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to erect a PVCU conservatory to the rear of the property at 6 William Brown Court, Norwood Road, London SE27 9DD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/03399/FUL, dated 28 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: 099/90245 1 of 2; 099/90245 2 of 2.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the design of the building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this ground floor flat which is within the 4 storey block of flats. The block has a long rear elevation which contains a variety of projections, bays and balconies. The elevations are a combination of brick, render and wide windows, mainly of PVC.
4. The proposal seeks permission to erect a conservatory type structure at the ground floor of the rear of the block. The proposal would be within the small enclosed private garden area of this flat. At this point the ground floor is set back in comparison with the first floor, which projects over.
5. The original design of the building with its variety of elements on different planes results in visual interest which breaks up the large face of the building. However, the overall effect does not rely on a specific pattern of set-backs or

projects to achieve this effect. Furthermore, the proposal would be largely visually contained within the enclosed rear garden of the flat and its effects outside this area would be very limited.

6. I have had regard to Policies Q5 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015 and the Council's SPD which, generally, seek to ensure that extensions respond positively to the original form of the building. Whilst the proposal would result in a change to the original building I find that it would not disrupt the rear elevation and its relationship with the surrounding parts of the original building would not have any negative visual effects. I consider that its relatively modest scale, its relationship with the various parts of the adjacent building and its containment within the enclosed rear garden of this flat mean that it would achieve the aims of the SPD and comply with the relevant aspects of the policies.
7. The Council has suggested 2 conditions in the event that the appeal is successful. These are the standard time limit and the implementation of the scheme in accordance with the approved plans. The latter condition is necessary in order to ensure certainty and that the approved scheme is implemented.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area and would comply with the Council's relevant policies and SPD. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR