



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/20/3254245

19 Acland Crescent, London SE5 8EQ

- 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 Hau Tran against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 20/01095/FUL, dated 24 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey ground floor rear extension to connect to existing outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey ground floor rear extension to connect to existing outbuilding at 19 Acland Crescent, London SE5 8EQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/01095/FUL, dated 24 March 2020, 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: Location Plan, Drawing numbers: 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07 and 08.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and area; and, the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 Acland Crescent (No 21).

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling with a detached garage just beyond its rear elevation along the shared boundary with No 21 and a further outbuilding along the rear boundary of its generous rear garden. The streetscene along Acland Crescent comprises pairs of semi-detached dwellings interspersed with detached houses. A number of these properties have been

extended and altered and are in a range of styles, giving the area a varied character and appearance.

4. The proposed extension would extend to the side and rear of the host property. When viewed from the highway, the front of the proposed extension would be flush with the front of the host property, largely infilling the existing gap to No 21. However, this part of the extension would complement a similar single-storey side extension at No 21 and the retention of gaps between these properties at first-floor level, would provide sufficient separation to reinforce their original semi-detached forms.
5. Although the proposed extension would have a sizeable floor area and depth, in part, this would incorporate the footprint of the existing garage. There would also be no significant reduction to the size of the rear garden to the host property. Therefore, the footprint of the proposed extension would not be excessive. Also, the single-storey, flat roofed form of the proposed extension, along with the use of roof lanterns would limit its overall mass. Drawing on these reasons, the proposed extension would be a subordinate addition which would assimilate with the host property and the streetscene.
6. Consequently, the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and area. I therefore find no conflict with Policies Q5 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) (LP) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Building Alterations and Extensions (2015)(SPD) which collectively require that development responds to the positive aspects of the local context and that extensions which unacceptably dominate or overwhelm the host building will not be supported.

Living conditions

7. No 21 includes living accommodation which incorporate windows and glazed doors that face its rear garden. Nevertheless, its extensive rear garden is largely enclosed by existing boundary treatments and the garage along the shared boundary with the appeal property.
8. The proposed extension would extend beyond the rear elevation of No 21. In part, this would exceed the height of the existing boundary fence. However, the flat roof design of the extension would generally limit this to a modest height of about 2.9m. Moreover, a section of the proposed extension, nearest to the rear elevation of No 21 would be stepped back from the shared boundary. This, along with a reduction in the height of the existing garage would limit any unacceptable degree of enclosure or loss of outlook for the occupiers of No 21.
9. For the above reasons, the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 21 and therefore accords with Policy Q2 of the LP and the Council's adopted SPD, which amongst other things seek to secure adequate outlook and avoid any undue sense of enclosure.

Other matters

10. I have not been referred to any minimum requirement for the retained gap between the proposed extension and No 21. Any specific issue in relation to water and leaves gathering in this gap, along with the maintenance of properties would be for the relevant parties. The proposed side facing doors and windows would face existing boundary treatments and are therefore

unlikely to result in any loss of privacy. While matters relating to fire safety may be addressed under other legislation, this does not affect the planning merits of the scheme.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission, I have also specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition relating to proposed materials is necessary in the interests of the appearance and finish of the development.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR