



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2017

by L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 04 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/17/3176258

17 Fieldhouse Road, London, SW12 0HL

- 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 Ms Sana Khareghani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 17/01109/FUL, dated 6 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as "mansard roof extension rear of property – conservation rooflights to front elevation".
-

Preliminary Matter

1. Drawing No. 022-01, Existing: Elevation 03 (Rear) and Drawing No. 031-01, Existing: Section B state "Assume stair, handrail and structure below demolished for the purposes of this planning application" in reference to the outdoor staircase to the rear of the property. This sentiment is repeated on Drawing No. 002-01, Existing: First Floor Plan where it is stated that such works can be undertaken without planning permission.
2. This staircase is, however, shown on the proposed plans and its removal does not form part of the description of development. The staircase was in situ at the time of my site visit. The question as to whether or not such demolition can be carried out without the need for planning permission is not before me and is a matter for discussion with the Council.
3. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on the basis that the demolition of the staircase, handrail and structure below does not form part of the proposal before me. I have reached my determination on this basis and grant planning permission for the mansard roof to the rear of the property and conservation rooflights to the front only.

Decision

4. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for mansard roof extension rear of property – conservation rooflights to front elevation at 17 Fieldhouse Road, London, SW12 0HL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/01109/FUL, dated 6 March 2017 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, except insofar as they relate to the removal of the outdoor rear stair, handrail and structure below: Ordnance Survey Location Plan, Drawing No. 002-01 - Existing: First Floor Plan - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 002-02 - Proposed: First Floor Plan - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 003-01 - Existing: Second Floor Plan - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 003-02 - Proposed: Second Floor Plan - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 004-01 - Existing: Roof Plan - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 004-02 - Proposed: Roof Plan Rev (B) - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 020-01 - Existing: Elevation 01 (Front) - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 020-02 - Proposed: Elevation 01 (Front) Rev (A) - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 021-01 - Existing: Elevation 02 (Flank 01) - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 021-02 - Proposed: Elevation 02 (Flank 01) Rev (A) - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 022-01 - Existing: Elevation 03 (Rear) - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 022-02 - Proposed: Elevation 03 (Rear) Rev (A) - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 023-01 - Existing: Elevation 04 (Flank 02) - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 023-02 - Proposed: Elevation 04 (Flank 02) Rev (A) - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 030-01 - Existing: Section A - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 030-02 - Proposed: Section A Rev (A) - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 031-01 - Existing: Section B - dated 4/7/16, Drawing No. 031-02 - Proposed: Section B Rev (A) - dated 4/7/16
- 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

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area; including whether or not the development would preserve or enhance the Hyde Farm Conservation Area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property, No. 17 Fieldhouse Road, is a two-storey mid-terraced dwelling situated within the Hyde Farm Conservation Area (CA). The area is characterised by similar terraces of uniform properties. The rear of the property has a distinctive two-storey return with an outdoor staircase which mirrors that present at the neighbouring property.
7. The CA is a "heritage asset" as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which seeks to ensure that heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.
8. The proposal is for the erection of a rear mansard roof extension, alteration of the rear first floor window and the installation of three rooflights to the front elevation.
9. The three front rooflights would be in a conservation style and would align with the first-floor windows below whilst maintaining even spacing between them. Whilst the addition of rooflights would constitute a notable change to the roof form of the property they would be of a conservation style and would be sympathetic to the design and character of the existing dwelling.
10. I noted a number of other examples of rooflights in the vicinity during my site visit, including those at No. 15 next door. Such rooflights appear to be fairly

commonplace; such that I would consider that they have become a part of the character and appearance of the area.

11. The remaining alterations would be to the rear of the property and would not be visible from the street. The rear first-floor window of the two-storey return would be replaced with a larger window. This larger window would be proportionally more in keeping with the property's other windows. The proposed window would also enhance the symmetry of the return by better reflecting the design of the mirror image window at the neighbouring dwelling.
12. The mansard roof would indisputably alter the appearance of the rear roof slope of the property. Whilst the proposal would add bulk to the roof this would not be to such an extent so as to cause harm. The roof slope is sufficient to accommodate an extension of the scale proposed without resultant damage to the character and appearance of the host property.
13. The proposed rear dormers would be positioned approximately in line with the windows on the stories below and would be appropriately proportioned so as to ensure that they appear subservient to the host dwelling.
14. I noted a number of other rear dormers in the surrounding area, including at No. 15 next door. The neighbouring dormers already have the effect of unbalancing the symmetry between No's 15 and 17 and have changed the roofscape of the terrace thus diluting the architectural integrity. The remaining symmetry largely stems from the rear returns and outdoor staircases of the terrace. Whilst the proposed mansard and dormers would further change the appearance of the terrace, the key features and character of the host property and the terrace as a whole would be retained.
15. Furthermore, the proposed roof alterations would be largely screened by the existing two-storey return and would not be prominent in views towards the rear of the property.
16. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the wider area and would preserve the character and appearance of the Hyde Farm Conservation Area.
17. I note concerns raised by residents of nearby properties regarding the effect of the proposal on their privacy. However, some overlooking is common in urban environments such as this and, moreover, I consider that the proposed windows would be sufficiently distant from those properties so as not to cause undue harm to living conditions.
18. I have therefore found no conflict with Policies Q2, Q5 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan, 2015 (LP) which, amongst other things, seek to make certain that extensions are subordinate to their hosts, protect visual amenity and ensure that development is visually attractive and reflects positive aspects of the local context in terms of built form and materials. The proposal would also accord with Policy Q22 of the LP which requires development within conservation areas to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area.
19. I acknowledge that the proposal would fail to meet the guidance set out in the Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in some specific respects. However, the SPD is guidance and, in my view, the proposal would not conflict with its aims to protect the character and appearance of the district and its heritage assets.

Conditions

20. In addition to the standard commencement condition, one that requires the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition which requires the external surfaces to match those of the existing building is also necessary in order to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the proposed development.

L J O'Brien

APPOINTED PERSON