
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2017

by Simon Warder MA BSc(Hons) DipUD(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/17/3173215

340 Kennington Lane, Lambeth, London SE11 5HY

- 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 Niala Tahir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 16/06823/FUL, dated 30 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host building and the Vauxhall Conservation Area;
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of No 338 with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal building is a three storey mid-terrace property with a full width, single storey rear extension and a two storey rear outrigger. The outrigger spans about half the width of the property, shares a pitched roof with No 342 and is characteristic of the terrace. The rear of the building, along with much of the rest of the terrace, can be seen in wide-ranging views from Glyn Street, Auckland Street and Vauxhall Pleasure Gardens, albeit that the detached building at 39 Glyn Street blocks views of the appeal property from some angles.
 4. The Conservation Area takes in a range of building types and open spaces. However, in the vicinity of the appeal site, the Conservation Area Statement (CAS) find that the 'repetitive character of rear elevations in terraces and groups is a key part of the character and appearance of the conservation area'. A number of other properties in the terrace have rear extensions, including some two storey, full width extensions. Whilst, as the CAS notes, such extensions can be dominant and harmful, sufficient of the rhythm and symmetry of the rear elevation remains to contribute positively to the
-

character of the terrace. Given the visibility of the rear of the terrace, these qualities also contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area.

5. The appeal proposal would create a full width, flat roof extension at first floor level. The rear windows at second floor level would also be re-positioned. By virtue of its height and width, the extension would dominate the rear of the building. The rhythm and characteristic built form created by the part-width rear outriggers would be further undermined and the symmetry of the shared pitched roof with No 342 would be lost. I recognise that the extension would use detailing, external materials and windows to match the existing building. However, this would not overcome my concerns regarding its height, width and form.
6. The appellant argues that the current proposal seeks to address the Council's concerns regarding an earlier proposal which included a second storey extension. Nevertheless, for the reasons set out above, I find that the current proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the Conservation Area.
7. As such, it would conflict with Policies Q5, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2015. Together, these policies require extensions to respond positively to local character in their built form and roofscapes, be subordinate to the host building and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas. The proposal would also conflict with the Council's Building Alterations and Extension Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to the extent that it has similar aims and with paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets to be taken into account.
8. In terms of the test set out in Framework paragraph 134, whilst the harm to the heritage asset would be less than substantial, I have not been made aware of any public benefits sufficient to outweigh it.

Living Conditions

9. The rear extension to No 338 includes a first floor window facing the common boundary with the appeal property. The outlook from this window is currently restricted by the rear wall of the building at 39 Glyn Street. The proposed extension would result in a solid, first floor level wall hard up against the common boundary, opposite and fairly close to the facing window at No 338. The height and proximity of the extension would, therefore, further constrain the outlook from that window. As such, it would be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 338 and contrary to LP Policy Q2 which seeks ensure to development provides adequate outlooks for neighbouring occupiers and avoids, wherever possible, any undue sense of enclosure.
10. I have had regard to the other concerns expressed locally, but none has led me to a different overall conclusion.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Simon Warder

INSPECTOR