



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020 by S Watson BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/20/3249632

104 Ferndale Road, London SW4 7SE

- 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 Niall Persaud & Helen Sainsbury against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 19/04541/FUL, dated 5 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey ground floor wraparound extension to the rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed single storey ground floor wraparound extension to the rear elevation at 104 Ferndale road, London SW4 7SE in accordance with the terms of application 19/04541/FUL, dated 5 December 2019 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: P11-FR-01, P11-FR-02, P11-FR-11, P11-FR-12, P11-FR-13, P11-FR-14, P11-FR-15, P11-FR-16, P11-FR-17, P11-FR-18, P11-FR-19.
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

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

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Ferndale Road Conservation Area (FRCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is on the north side of Ferndale Road, which is in the FRCA. I have not been provided with a conservation area appraisal, but from my site visit I judged that the significance of the conservation area derived from the character and appearance of the area, primarily from the age of the area and the appearance of the street scene. Ferndale Road is made up of two long terraces containing tall, narrow buildings, which while similar in style, are made up of small groups of properties with distinct styling on the front façade. I found the backs of the properties showed a great deal more individuality, even within the distinct groups, and that this formed a part of the interest of the buildings, alongside the repeating pattern of two-storey outriggers.
5. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. In this respect national planning policy on heritage assets is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). At paragraph 192, it sets out matters which should be taken into account including sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
6. The appeal site, as with the neighbouring properties, contains a three-storey terraced dwelling with a two-storey rear outrigger, set within a narrow but relatively long plot. The area of the rear garden covered by the proposal is largely screened from private and public views by the tall boundary treatments and the main railway line to the rear. The proposal is only of a limited scale relative to the host dwelling and would not form a bulky or disproportionate addition. As such it would not dominate the rear of the property nor the two-storey outrigger. Consequently, by way of its scale and screened location, it would not harm the legibility of the L-shape form of the host dwelling.
7. The proposed design and materials would be in keeping with the surroundings but would still allow for the proposal to be easily differentiated from the host dwelling, therefore retaining the legibility of the historic form. Moreover, although it would extend beyond the rear of the outrigger, as the L-shape form would be protected, and as the backs of the buildings are not uniform, the proposal would not conflict with the heritage principles of Policy Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (LLP). Therefore, by way of its design, the proposal would be sympathetic with the varied and cluttered appearance of the rear of the terrace, and would not result in harm to the key features of historic significance at the front of the terrace. As such although conflicting with the criteria set out in Q11(e)(i), the proposed extension would comply with the main thrust and purpose of LLP Policy Q11.
8. In conclusion the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would preserve the character and appearance of the FRCA. As such it would comply with Policies Q5, Q11 and Q22 which collectively require development to respect the host dwelling and local distinctiveness of an area, as well as preserving the character and appearance of conservation areas. The proposal would also accord with the main thrust of the guidance surrounding rear extensions and heritage assets as set out in the Building Alterations & Extensions supplementary planning document.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested conditions it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal was allowed. I have considered the suggested conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
10. I find that to ensure clarity, and in the interests of the appearance of the development, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. As the approved plans only show some external materials and are generic in terms, it is necessary to attach a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing, in the interest of the appearance of the development in this sensitive location.

Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Watson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and concur that the appeal should be allowed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR