



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2017

by R J Marshall LLB DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/17/3180374
56A, Helix Road, London SW2 2JS

- 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 Adam Harrison against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 17/00925/FUL, dated 1 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey ground floor rear and side extension to flat A.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are: **first**, the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and **second**, its effect on the living conditions of those in the adjoining property, No. 54, with special reference to visual impact and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a ground floor flat in terraced house of Victorian/Edwardian style. As is typical of other properties on the road this terraced house has a 3 storey rear extension set back from the neighbouring boundary, thus leaving a gap between the extension and the neighbouring boundary wall. The proposal is for a first floor extension that would fill in most of this gap and extend around the rear of the extension.
4. The proposed extension is designed with a "sawtooth" roof form. This feature would be entirely uncharacteristic of the design of the property to which it would be attached and of other houses and rear extensions in the road. Although reducing the bulk of the proposed extension it would give a degree of prominence to it that would detract from the character and appearance of the existing property. Given the location of the extension and screening available in nearby gardens views of the extension would to some degree be limited. However, views of the extension would still be sufficient for such an out of keeping development to be seen in a way that would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

5. It is concluded that the proposed development would detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies Q5 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (LP) (2015) which seek to ensure that extensions respond positively to the original architecture and roof form of the host building.

Living conditions

6. The proposed extension would lie immediately adjacent to the boundary of the adjoining property to the north, no. 54 Helix Road. Given the length of the extension, its height and proximity to the boundary it would appear unduly intrusive in views from this property from the rear garden and side passage. This will be so notwithstanding the sawtooth roof design.
7. Given that, from what I saw, light is already restricted to the rear garden area and windows of no. 54 at there would be no unacceptable loss of sunlight or daylight to this neighbouring property. No substantial evidence has been provided for me to take a contrary view.
8. It is concluded that whilst I have found no evidence that there would be an unacceptable loss of light to the neighbouring property the proposed extension would appear unacceptably intrusive when seen from it. As such there would be harm to the living conditions of its occupants through visual impact. There would be conflict with LP Policy Q2 which seeks to protect residential amenity.

Other matters

9. The proposed extension has been well designed internally and would provide improved living accommodation.

Conclusion

10. The proposed development would be harmful in the ways outlined above. Such harm is not outweighed by the improved living accommodation that would be provided. Thus for the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

R J Marshall

INSPECTOR