



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2017

by Richard S Jones BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/17/3174160
60 Lambert Road, London SW2 5BH

- 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 Henry Fellows against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 16/06767/FUL, dated 2 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear-facing mansard on existing pitched roof and internal remodelling works to 60 Lambert Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear-facing mansard on existing pitched roof and internal remodelling works to 60 Lambert Road, London, SW2 5BH, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/06767/FUL, dated 2 December 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan; 010; 020; 110 Revision E; 121 Revision A and 121 Revision G.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an attractive two storey property on the corner of Lambert Road and Strathleven Road. It has two gable roof projections facing each of the roads, whilst the elevation to Lambert Road also includes a bell-shaped feature at roof level, which I agree contributes to the attractiveness of the building.
4. The proposed mansard roof extension would run across the full width of the east facing roof slope and in doing so result in the loss of the existing traditional pitch of the roof. However, it would be set well back from the

elevation facing onto Lambert Road and would be cut in to match the roof profile of the south facing hip. Therefore in approaching views from the west along Strathleven Road, where the main roof profile is primarily viewed, the hipped roof form would appear unaffected.

5. Moreover, because of the set-back, the screening provided by the existing gables and the bell shaped feature, combined with the use of matching materials, the proposal would not be prominent or indeed particularly visible from the street scene along Lambert Road. Consequently it would not be seen to an extent whereby it would create additional clutter to the roofscape. I appreciate that the repositioned door would cut into the eaves line whereas the existing door does not, however, the width of the intervention is very limited and would not likely be visible from any public vantage point. Therefore, although I accept that mansard roof extensions are not characteristic of the area, the proposal would have a very limited effect on the perceived architectural composition of the host building.
6. The officer report states that whilst the principle of installing roof lights to the front roof slope would be acceptable, the side elevation roof light would add visual clutter to the building. However, in my view the Lambert Road elevation, which is referred to in the reason for refusal, is not read as such and in visual terms the building has two principal elevations. Furthermore, the positioning of the two roof lights facing Strathleven Road and the single roof light facing Lambert Road is such that they would not be seen at the same time. Moreover, roof lights are not an uncommon feature in other nearby dwellings and, in any case, the positioning and limited size of the Lambert Road facing roof light would not create a prominent feature from the public realm.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have no material effect on the character or appearance of the host building or the surrounding area. As such I do not find conflict with Lambeth Local Plan Policies Q2, Q8 or Q11 or the Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document. These state, amongst other matters, that roof additions and mansards will not be supported where they would harm the architectural integrity of the original building and that roof lights should generally be modest in size and placed and aligned to sensitively respect the character of the host building.

Other matters

8. I have noted the concerns of neighbouring residents, however, the appeal proposal will not materially increase the level of overlooking from that which already exists. Moreover, given its size and positioning it will not result in any material overshadowing or loss of light.

Conditions

9. I have had regard to the conditions that have been suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard condition that limits the lifespan of the planning permission, I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have imposed a condition requiring the external materials used in the development to match those used in the existing building.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Richard S Jones

INSPECTOR