
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2019

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/19/3230208

51 Thornbury Road, London SW2 4DL

- 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 Phil Dewar Durie against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 19/00169/FUL, dated 15 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of roof to habitable accommodation with rear dormer extension, extension over the rear outrigger and two front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council's Decision Notice and the appellant's Appeal Form describe the proposal as "erection of an L-shaped roof extension comprised of a rear Juliet balcony and the installation of two rooflights on the front roof slope". As this more accurately reflects the proposed development I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed roof extension on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The residential area surrounding the site is formed of long terraces of dwellings. The appeal site is a mid-terraced dwelling, the front and rear of which are visible from the surrounding streets. Some of the dwellings nearby incorporate rear roof extensions. Whilst the roofscape is varied due to the architectural form of the dwellings, its original rhythm and form remains largely intact.
5. The proposed roof extension would be set inward from the eaves of the main roof and the lower rear projection. The roof extension would also be set aligned with the neighbouring extension to the outrigger of No 49, some distance from the rear façade. However, the proposed roof extension would fill the majority of the roof slopes to the rear of the dwelling. Whilst the materials of construction would match the existing dwelling, due to the number and proportions of the window openings, the proposed roof extension would take on a rather solid

appearance. Although views of the proposed roof extension would be limited from within the public realm to a small section of Rosebery Road, they would be clearly visible from neighbouring properties and their gardens. The proposed roof extension would therefore appear unduly dominant and inharmonious with the roof of the existing dwelling and the wider roofscape.

6. I appreciate that the rear roof slopes of dwellings to both sides of Thornbury Road have been altered in a manner similar to the appeal scheme, including No 49 and several dwellings visible from Wingford Road. However, the existence of similar roof extensions in the locality would not provide justification for a further development that I consider would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
7. The appellant has also suggested that the appeal scheme is similar to that with planning permission at 82 Pentney Road in Lambeth and has included the plans and officer report. In that case, the officer report clearly identifies that alterations to the roofscape are so prominent amongst the terrace of dwellings that they form part of the urban grain and architectural character of that area. However, the same cannot be said for the appeal site, as extensions are infrequent within the roofscape between Thornbury Road and Rosebery Road. Therefore, this would not be a comparable development to the appeal scheme.
8. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed roof extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposals would not therefore accord with Policies Q5 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan Adopted September 2015, or the guidance within the Council's Building Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document Adopted September 2015, to which I have had due regard. The policy and guidance therein seek to ensure that the design of development positively responds to the original architecture of the host building and the roofscape of the local context. Development should also not unacceptably dominate the host building.

Other Matters

9. I note that the appeal proposal has not led to objections from neighbours and that the additional living space is necessary to meet the needs of the appellant and his family. Nevertheless, taking the proposal on its individual merits, it would harmfully change the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.
10. The proposal also includes two rooflights on the front roof slope. They would be modest in size and positioned in an appropriate manner within the roof slope, I therefore find no harm in respect of this element of the proposal and note that the Council raised no objection in this regard either. Whilst the proposed rooflights are physically severable from and capable of being built without the roof extensions to the rear, they would not be functionally severable, as they could not be used for their intended purpose without the roof extensions. In light of this, a split decision would not be a logical outcome.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR