The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 May 2020

by Ian Harrison BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/20/3245278
143 Hydethorpe Road, Balham, London SW12 0JF

- 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 Graeme Hogarth against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
- The application Ref 19/03293/FUL, dated 9 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2019.
- The development proposed is the erection of a ground floor single storey rear and side infill extension and a first floor rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a ground floor single storey rear and side infill extension and a first floor rear extension at 143 Hydethorpe Road, Balham, London SW12 0JF in accordance with the terms of the application, 19/03293/FUL, dated 9 September 2019, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

    2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, P-1, P-2, P-3 and P-4

    3) The materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description used above has been taken from the application form and reflects the development for which planning permission was sought by the appellant. Whilst the Council have used a slightly different description, I have not received confirmation that the amended description has been agreed. In any event, the difference between the descriptions of development is minor and does not alter the development that is shown on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a residential area, with the built form along Hydethorpe Road consisting mostly of terraced dwellings of similar scale and appearance that have a variety of single and two storey projections and dormer

roof extensions to the rear. The mid-terrace dwelling at the appeal site conforms with the surrounding pattern of built form, with a two storey outrigger, a further single storey projection and a dormer roof extension at the rear, all of which are visible from Radbourne Road. The visibility of these projections and the other similar features of surrounding dwellings, along with the irregular arrangement of the terraced dwellings within Radbourne Road results in that street having a more varied appearance and pattern of development than Hydethorpe Road.

5. The proposal would see the erection of a single storey extension at the side and rear of the existing 2 storey outrigger, with the first floor of the outrigger also being extended to the rear. The roof of the ground floor extension and the first floor extension would be visible above the boundary enclosures at the site and would therefore have some effect on the appearance of the dwelling as seen from Radbourne Road and the dwellings and gardens surrounding the site.

6. The proposed first floor extension would represent a small addition that would not cause the loss of the existing outrigger or result in it becoming insubordinate to the host dwelling. The proposed extension would replicate the roof form and proportions of the existing part of the outrigger that serves the host dwelling and utilise complimentary materials, thereby showing suitable regard for the appearance of the existing dwelling.

7. In the context of the properties of the surrounding area which feature rear projections and dormers of varied scale and appearance, the extension would not be unduly large or have an appearance that would be incongruous. In addition, although the proposal would disrupt the symmetry with the outrigger at the neighbouring property, the lack of uniformity to the appearance and form of the dwellings in the terrace and the wider locality means that the effect of this on the overall character of the area would be minor. Furthermore, whilst paired outriggers are a feature of some properties within the locality, the variety of projections at the rear of dwellings ensures that the unbalancing of the pair that exists at the appeal site and the neighbouring property would not be incongruous in the context of the surrounding area.

8. The Council's Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document, adopted 2015, (The SPD) primarily requires extensions to be subordinate in scale and, for the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposal would accord with that requirement. Although the SPD states that closet returns are usually no deeper than they are wide, the existing and surrounding rear projections do not reflect this characteristic. As such, the proposal not conforming with the guidance that is contained within the SPD would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace or the locality.

9. The single storey extension would also be proportionate to the existing building and would not contrast with the inconsistent form of extensions that have occurred within the locality. Therefore, when considered individually and cumulatively, the extensions would not be insubordinate to the existing building and would not disrupt the architecture of the existing dwelling or the terrace that it is a part of. Furthermore, the extensions would not have an appearance that would be discordant in the context of the area.

10. For the reasons given above, the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. Therefore, the development would accord with policies Q5 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (Adopted September 2015) which combine to require that existing outriggers are retained, infill extensions are single storey and all extensions are

subordinate to the host building and of a design that is responsive to the local context and the architecture of the host building.

Conclusion and Conditions

11. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission should be granted subject to the conditions set out above. I have attached a condition to require the development to be undertaken in accordance with the submitted plans in the interests of clarity. I have also imposed a condition to require the development to be undertaken utilising materials that match the existing dwelling in the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the locality.

Ian Harrison

INSPECTOR