
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 27 August 2019

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/19/3222705

21 Stockwell Park Road, London SW9 0AP

- 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 Alistair Prain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 18/02823/FUL, dated 3 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 28 August 2018.
 - The development proposed is extension to basement utility under the front garden and replacement of existing rear/side conservatories with glazed rear/side extensions including alterations to existing rear projection including installation of rear French doors and associated internal alterations.
-

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/Y/19/3222708

21 Stockwell Park Road, London SW9 0AP

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Alistair Prain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 18/02824/LB, dated 3 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 28 August 2018.
 - The works proposed are extension to basement utility under the front garden and replacement of existing rear/side conservatories with glazed rear/side extensions including alterations to existing rear projection including installation of rear French doors and associated internal alterations.
-

Decisions

1. The appeals are both dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have corrected the spelling mistake in the appellant's name as it appeared on the planning and appeal forms. I have used the full description of the proposal as it appears on the Council's decision notice and used by the appellant on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the significance of the listed building.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to this detached 2 storey plus basement house which is situated within the Stockwell Park Conservation Area. The property is one of a number of similar grade II listed villas which are said to date from the mid-19th Century. The property has a handsome and formal front elevation and has undergone some alterations evident at the rear.
5. The rear has been subjected to extensions which have resulted in a central full-height closet wing and 2 relatively small conservatories to either side of the rear elevation. The Council has granted planning permission and listed building consent for a very similar scheme to the appeal proposal. The only difference being the size and design of a central rear set of doors/windows. It is clear that the Council's objection to the appeal scheme relates solely to the central doors/windows.
6. The appellant states that there is no significance in the rear section of the building which would accommodate the central doors/windows. This part of the building is of relatively recent construction, resulting from permission in 1998. However, I can see that some care was taken in the size and style of the windows so that they complement the original building. The windows within the extension have shallow arched heads with flat brick arches over, replicating features on the original building, within the rear elevation. Whilst the appellant is critical of some elements of this extension I find that it is complementary to the original building in respect of these items.
7. The appeal scheme would result in the replacement of the existing modest conservatories with larger structures and the central doors would be replaced by a wider and marginally taller set of doors/windows. This would represent a significant increase in the size of the doors/windows when compared to the approved scheme. The existing complementary arched-topped doors would be lost and the proposal would have a distinctly horizontal emphasis which would conflict with the vertical emphasis of the existing design. In this way I consider that the proposal would bring about alterations which would have a harmful effect on the design, character and thereby significance of the listed building. In relation to the level of harm that I identify, I judge this to be 'less than substantial' harm, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. I consider that there are no public benefits that would outweigh this harm. Therefore, the proposal conflicts with Policy Q20 of the Lambeth Local Plan.
8. I have considered all other matters raised in the representations but I find nothing to outweigh the harm that I have identified. Therefore, the appeals are dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR