



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 4 February 2020

by Edward Cousins BA, BL, LLM, Barrister

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 May 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/19/3237748

71b Helix Road, London, SW2 2JR

- 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 Edward Jackson against the decision of London Borough of Lambeth to grant planning consent.
 - The application Ref 19/00685/FUL, dated 22 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a rear roof extension and the installation of two front roof lights to Flat B (retrospective application).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. As part of the appeal process the appellant submitted two photographs apparently recently taken from the rear of the 71b Helix Road (the host property). These photographs show the roof extension as constructed (the roof extension), the subject matter of the appeal. They had not been sent to the Planning Inspectorate at an earlier stage. This meant that were not included in the appeal file but were subsequently sent following the site visit. Nevertheless, as they reflected the current position I consider that by my accepting them, this would not prejudice the interests of other parties to the appeal, including the Council.
3. All the works envisaged by the proposed development appear to have been completed.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The host property is a two storey Victorian terraced dwelling house, situated on the east side of Helix Road. It lies in a section of roadway which contains four terrace rows of dwellings, namely Nos 43-129. A common feature of the area is that the roofs of the houses are characterised by a dual pitched roof form building style at the front. To the rear of the host property lie the terraced dwelling houses and back gardens of Leander Road.
6. The roof extension to the host property is a rear full width box dormer construction at second floor level, and as such does not meld into the remainder of the roof of the host property. Its scale is disproportionate and inappropriate as it fails to harmonise with the host property. The roof of the host property therefore no longer remains the dominant element in the overall architectural integrity of the dwelling house but is subordinate to it.
7. The proposed development is, in effect, a second floor level extension, and as such is an incongruous and bulky addition to the host property. It further fails to reflect the scale, symmetry and design of other examples of dormer windows in the locality.
8. In so far as the appellant provides some 20 examples in Helix Road where rear roof dormer extensions either constructed or currently under construction, some 12 were assessed under previous legislation. In particular, seven examples of roof extensions to the dwellings lying between 43-129 Helix Road were the subject of permitted development rights, namely at Nos 47, 67, 87, 101, 109, and 121, as is the development at 26 Helix Road.
9. I therefore consider that the proposed development cannot be described as a "modestly sized dormer roof extension". Further, as a full width box dormer it is not an established feature for roof extensions in the area and is not supported by current policy.
10. In summary, I therefore find that the development is detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. As a consequence, the proposed development is in conflict with Policies Q5 (Local distinctiveness) and Q11 (Building alterations and extensions) of the Lambeth Local Plan Policies (2015) and contrary to the guidance on design contained in Lambeth Council's Supplementary Policy Document: Building Alterations and Extensions (2015).

Other Matters

11. I accept that no objection has been raised by any neighbours to the proposed development, and that no loss of light has been identified arising from the proposed development. I have taken these matters into account when reaching my conclusions in this decision. However, on balance I consider that the absence of harm on these matters does not

alter the harm that results from the implementation of the proposed development.

Conclusion

12. Therefore, for the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Edward Cousins

INSPECTOR