



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2019

by W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/19/3234076

Second Floor Flat, 93 Old South Lambeth Road, London SW8 1XU

- 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 Laura Astengo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 19/00730/FUL, dated 25 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Mansard loft conversion'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area, including the setting of No's 97 -105 (odd), which are Grade II Listed.

Reasons

3. The host dwelling is a second floor flat of an end terraced property located on Old South Lambeth Road. However, access to the host dwelling is taken from an entrance on Dorset Road. The host property is 3no. storeys in height with a decorative timber shop front located at ground floor, which turns the corner, along Dorset Road. On the first and second storeys, the facing material is yellow stock brick with red brick coursing. On the elevation facing Old South Lambeth Road are 2no. ornate tripartite windows and on the elevation facing Dorset Road are sash windows with stone cills and period brick/stone lintels. Close to the site and within the terrace are 5no. Listed Buildings in the direction towards Meadow Place.
4. No 97 Old South Lambeth Road is on the same building line as the host dwelling and is separated by one property. No 97 is 2no. storeys in height with an 18th Century shape, but a 19th century front. At ground floor is a 19th Century shop front with doors either side with fan lights above. The door to the right when facing the front of No 97 differs from the door to the left as it consists of 6 panels.
5. No's 99 to 105 (odd) form a short terrace of similar designed 2no. storey properties with basements dating from the 19th Century. They are constructed from stock brick. The properties and remainder of the properties forming this terrace to the Meadow Place junction are set further back from the pavement edge than the host property. The front doors at ground floor on all of the

- properties have 4no. panels with rectangular fan lights located above, and are all located on a higher level when compared to the adjacent pavement, with access through individual steps enclosed with wrought iron railings.
6. The proposal is for the current attic room to be converted into a habitable room through the construction of a mansard roof and raising the existing ridge height. The proposed development would include 4no. dormer windows and a Juliet style balcony within the mansard roof. The host property is already visually prominent in the street due to its corner site location and is taller than the neighbouring listed buildings. The existing roof is a modest hipped roof set behind parapet walls, which is not clearly visible in proximity to the host property. However, from an increased distance along Dorset Road and Heyford Terrace it is possible to view the roof, which has a distinctly subordinate relationship with the existing property.
 7. In contrast, the proposal would represent a large bulky addition to the property that would be visually dominant, forming an unsympathetic feature in the street scene that would be clearly visible from surrounding streets. Overall, I find that the proposed development to the host property would be excessive. Although not adjoining, I nevertheless find that the proposed development falls within the setting of No's 97 to 105 (odd), due to their proximity and the visibility of the appeal site from their principal elevations. This effect is increased in the case of No 97 as it is closer to the site and on a similar building line.
 8. My attention has been drawn to other residential properties in the area that have benefitted from extensions to their roofs, including a development to a property located on Meadow Place. Whilst noting the presence of these extensions, relatively little detail has been provided regarding the particular planning backgrounds to those schemes. Without such information a full and detailed comparison between those developments and the case before me cannot be drawn except insofar as I was able to observe and assess the sites at my visit. In any event, the fact that apparently similar roof developments may exist is not a reason, on its own, to allow otherwise unacceptable development.
 9. I have a statutory duty under Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. I consider the proposed development would not accord with this duty.
 10. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not accord with the character, appearance and heritage aims of Policies Q5, Q11 and Q20 of the Council's Local Plan 2015 and the guidance contained within the Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2015.
 11. Additionally, the proposed development would not conserve the heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance in line with the Framework. I find that the proposed development would result in "less than substantial" harm to the setting of the listed buildings for the purposes of paragraph 196 of the Framework. The proposal would add an additional habitable room to the host property and would result in some limited economic and social benefits through the construction phase of the development. However, as public benefits, these

would not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed buildings.

Other Matters

12. I have also had regard to concerns raised by the appellant about the way that the Council handled the application, with particular regard to the Pre-Application advice received, but this does not affect the planning merits of the case. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR