



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2020

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/19/3243888
82 Riggindale Road, London SW16 1QJ

- 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 and Mrs Haire against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 19/03268/FUL, dated 5 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing infill extension and erection of a single storey ground floor infill extension, including re-paving the patio and other external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development has been altered on the decision notice to read 'Demolition of the existing infill extension and erection of a single storey ground floor infill extension, including re-paving the patio and other external alterations'. This more succinctly describes the proposal and I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The Council have raised no concerns relating to the re-paving of the patio or other external alterations and I have no reason to disagree.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the single storey ground floor infill extension on the character and appearance of the Streatham Park and Garrads Road Conservation Area (the conservation area).

Reasons

5. The proposal relates to a large residential property on the western side of Riggindale Road within the conservation area. A well sized garden stretches to the rear, beyond which runs a railway line. Many of the properties on this section of the road include single storey extensions of varying depths to their rear elevations.
6. The demolition of the existing infill extension and the erection of a single storey ground floor infill extension is proposed. The draft Streatham Park and Garrads Road Conservation Area Statement (2016) notes that the appeal property and those nearby are rich in architectural detail in the Queen Anne style. It advises

that houses in this design are dominated by pitched roofs and that repetition, in places, gives a strong sense of rhythm and visual unity to the roofscape. The roofscape therefore forms one of the defining features of the character and appearance of the conservation area.

7. Whilst pitched roofs dominate in the main, I also observed that flat roofed extensions are evident to the rear elevations of adjacent properties. Through their common occurrence, along with the pitched roofs, they do contribute towards providing rhythm and visual unity to the roofscape to the rear of the properties on Riggindale Road.
8. The design of the barrel-vaulted roof would be significantly out of keeping with the existing roof forms on the host property and those within the immediately surrounding area. Its inclusion would therefore result in the extension forming a significantly discordant and incongruous feature within the rear garden environment.
9. Whilst I accept that some arched features are visible in very limited extent on the front elevation of the host property and within the area, such features appear to generally relate to decorative detailing above doorways and windows as opposed to anything more substantial.
10. The extension would be set in between single storey rear outriggers of greater depth at both neighbouring properties and would square off the current rear elevation which has a slight step. Within this context and mindful of the limited projection of the extension I consider that it would remain subordinate to the host dwelling.
11. The extension would create some distinction between the rear single storey elements. It would not be constructed of inappropriate materials and while I do not doubt that the rooflights could be accommodated in a structurally robust manner, the single storey ground floor infill extension by reason of its barrel-vaulted roof design would detract from the appearance of the property. Subsequently, it would detract from the heritage significance of the conservation area which lies, in part, with its roofscape.
12. The harm to the significance of the Conservation Area would be less than substantial. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires such harm to be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal.
13. The benefits of this scheme would be limited to the provision of improved family living space at the appeal property. However, this benefit would primarily be a personal one for the appellant and there are no public benefits which would outweigh the harm. While I accept that the extension would generally only be seen from private views, I am mindful of the statutory protection afforded to conservation areas.
14. Consequently, the development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area contrary to Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), Policies Q5, Q8, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) which amongst other things seek high quality development appropriate to local character (including roofscapes) which protects heritage assets. It would also be contrary to SPD¹ guidance which reflects these principles.

¹ Lambeth Building Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (September 2015)

Other Matters

15. Concern has been raised by the appellant as to their ability to communicate with the Council during the application period. However only very limited details have been supplied and I cannot afford this matter significant weight. Other planning applications have also been brought to my attention, although only in very limited detail and a scheme which shares the characteristics of the appeal proposal has not been brought before me. I can only therefore afford these matters limited weight.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR