



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2019 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/19/3238024

45 Copley Park, London SW16 3DB

- 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 Roberto Martignoni against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 19/01826/FUL, dated 21 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 August 2019.
 - The proposed development is the erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The proposal as originally described in the application form included alterations to the front driveway and adjacent hard and soft landscaping. However, during the course of the application, revised drawings were provided by the appellant which omitted these works. The appeal form at section E includes an amended description and this is reflected on the decision notice and more accurately describes the amended proposal. As such, in the interests of accuracy, I have used that description of the proposed development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site, surrounding area and Streatham Lodge Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse on the eastern side of Copley Park. The site is situated within the Streatham Lodge Estate Conservation Area, whose significance is largely derived from the distinctive, Arts and Crafts-inspired architecture of the properties it contains. The appeal property forms part of a trio of semi-detached pairs, Nos. 37-47, which lie between the junctions of Copley Park with Heybridge Avenue to the north and Cedarville Gardens to the south. The appeal property and Nos. 37-43 each feature a single-storey rear wing with a distinctive lean-to roof. While the
-

rear wing of No. 47, which adjoins the appeal property to the south, has been replaced by a wide single-storey rear extension, the replacement extension still retains a lean-to roof design. These lean-to roofs are characteristic of this trio of semi-detached pairs and are all visible within public views from Heybridge Avenue and Cedarville Gardens.

6. The depth, width and overall height of the proposed rear extension would be broadly comparable to extensions at Nos. 37 and 47. However, as the proposed extension would incorporate a flat roof extension with green roof which would result in the loss of the distinctive lean-to roof, it would have a significantly different appearance. The more box like form would be incompatible with the more sculpted form and architectural integrity of the appeal property and Nos. 37-47. Furthermore, the large glass sliding doors and the use of zinc cladding and red brick would not relate positively to the proportions, materiality and Arts and Crafts-style detailing of the host building or other properties within the group. The proposal would therefore cause harm to the appearance of the appeal property, the architectural cohesion of Nos. 37-47, and the appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Streatham Lodge Estate Conservation Area.
7. I saw that the group is not characterised by a stepped design at the rear of the properties due to various extensions which have been implemented at ground floor level. As has occurred at other locations as pointed out by the appellant. However, there remains a clear cohesion between the properties as they share similar fenestration, materiality, detailing and lean-to roof forms. In consideration of these factors, the proposal would fail to respond positively to the character and appearance of the appeal property and neighbouring buildings.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to the designation report of the Conservation Area. Whilst I accept there is no specific mention of rear elevations in the Conservation Area designation report, it does reference the importance of the area's Arts and Crafts inspired character. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area and so would therefore detract from the significance of the Conservation Area.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the site, surrounding area and Streatham Lodge Estate Conservation Area, which would not be preserved. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policies Q5, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) and the Building Alterations & Extensions SPD (2015), which broadly require that proposals for extensions should preserve local distinctiveness, respond positively to the form of the original architecture and reinforce the character of conservation areas.
10. The harm to the significance of the Streatham Lodge Estate Conservation Area would be less than substantial. However, there would be no public benefits that would outweigh that harm.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has drawn my attention to similar development at Nos. 37 and 47 Copley Park. Whilst not determinative in themselves, I accept that

extensions at both of these properties do contribute to the character and appearance of Nos. 37-47 at the rear. However, as the extension at No. 47 was approved under permitted development prior to the designation of the Conservation Area, it is not directly comparable as a precedent. Furthermore, the extension at No. 37 retains the lean-to roof form at the rear.

12. The appellant has also drawn my attention to development at Nos. 42 and 44 Strathbrook Road. However, from the limited evidence before me, it is not clear whether the details and circumstances surrounding these developments are comparable to those of the proposal.
13. I have taken account of the presence of these extensions in my assessment above and regardless of these points on process, each appeal must be considered on its own merits which is how I have considered this appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR