



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2017

by A J Mageean BA (Hons) BPI PhD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/17/3171650
143 Denmark Road, London SE5 9LB

- 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 Graziano Usai against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 16/06750/FUL, dated 16 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is roof extension to existing Closet Wing's roof to allow for ceiling height and light.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof extension to existing Closet Wing's roof to allow for ceiling height and light at 143 Denmark Road, London SE5 9LB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/06750/FUL, dated 16 November 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: DR-PP100; DR-PP101; DR-PP102; DR-PP103; DR-PP104; DR-EX001; DR-EX002; DR-EX003; DR-EX004; DR-EX006.
 - 3) All new external brickwork and work of making good shall match existing brickwork in respect of materials used, detailed execution and finished appearance except where indicated otherwise on the drawings hereby approved.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the host property or the wider Minet Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a traditional three storey terrace with an original two storey rear addition, which in the recent past has been further extended. The properties adjoining to the south east appear to have retained the original form of their symmetrical two storey rear returns with mono pitched roofs and chimneys intact. This creates a consistency of appearance and strong visual rhythm across the rear of the terrace. The flank wall of the relatively recent development known as Bertha Neubergh House abuts the appeal property to the north west, rising to
-

a notably higher level. In this respect the distinctive character and setting of this building has been somewhat compromised.

4. Policy Q11(m) of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015 (Local Plan) states that roof additions will not be supported where they would harm the architectural integrity of the original building or its group. Where such additions are considered appropriate on locally distinctive buildings, reference is made to the importance of replicating locally distinct forms, materials and detailing. Guidance set out in the SPD¹ advises that in order to maintain subordination, roof extensions that extend over rear returns will generally be resisted.
5. The proposal would involve a small increase to the ridge height and a reduction in the pitch of the eastern half of the rear addition. Whilst rising slightly above the height of the current two storey addition, as well as those of the adjoining terraces, the extension would adjoin the main structure below the second floor level, thereby retaining a subordinate appearance in relation to the main building.
6. The extended wall would be brick built to match the existing side wall and its slate roof retained. The windows would run along the gap between the current and raised roof levels. In these respects the form and detailing of the extension would be discrete and sensitive, thereby maintaining the integrity of this property as part of the adjoining terrace row. Overall therefore, this would appear as a relatively modest extension to the roof both in terms of size and design.
7. The fact that the extension would be viewed against the backdrop of the flank elevation of the adjacent building would also mean that it would not appear noticeably incongruous or out of place. In this respect I accept the appellant's argument that the resulting 'stepping' of the roof profile would assist in managing the visual disparity between these two structures. Furthermore, as public views of the rear of this building are limited to a partial glimpsed view from Paulet Road, harm would not be caused in this regard.
8. As the appeal site is located within a Conservation Area I have had regard to section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. On the basis of the preceding analysis my view is that the effect of the proposal on this heritage asset would be neutral. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or the Minet Estate Conservation Area. It would therefore not conflict with the Local Plan Policies Q2, Q11 or Q22, or the SPD, which seek to ensure that development respects the characteristics of the local area.

Conclusion

9. As the proposal would comply with the development plan taken as a whole, I conclude that the appeal should succeed. This is subject to conditions which specify approved drawings as this provides certainly, and in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

AJ Mageean

INSPECTOR

¹ Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2015