

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2020

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/20/3256431

39 Leppoc Road, London, SW4 9LS

- 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 Ms Ritu Shirgaokar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 20/01563/FUL, dated 11 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear mansard roof extension including a juliet balcony and the installation of 1 front roof light and 1 relocated front roof light.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear mansard roof extension including a juliet balcony and the installation of 1 front roof light and 1 relocated front roof light at 39 Leppoc Road, London, SW4 9LS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01563/FUL, dated 11 May 2020, 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 following approved plans: BDR684.EX.01 & BDR684.PL.01.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the terrace.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an attractive and well detailed mid terrace two storey home with a lower three storey rear projection across about two thirds of the rear and a two storey extension beyond this. Back gardens from the street behind abut the end of the site's curtilage. Adjoining properties are broadly similar albeit with varied roof treatments and upper level additions and alterations. The area is of established residential character; pleasing details and broad architectural rhythm lead to an attractive appearance for this locality. The proposal is as described above; the mansard would be full width.
 4. The Council is concerned that the proposal by reason of its scale and design would be incongruous, lack subordination and negatively impact upon character and appearance.
-

5. Certainly this would be a sizeable roof addition and alteration. However its lines would be simple and the flat roof would not appear as unduly cumbersome in my opinion. It would sit below the ridge and views from ground level would never be seen as one whole. The outrigger on this and adjoining buildings is grander than in many instances in London and with this scale and its chimney arrangement it is presently, and would continue to be, the most prominent part of the rear scene on this property. The mansard would be relatively modest backdrop to this. The sense of a diminished scale to the works would also be aided by the appeal property being at lower eaves height than adjoining No 41. In terms of the planned Juliet balcony arrangement, I would agree with the Council's concerns in many instances about such structures but in this instance the positioning would be relatively discreet between substantial projections here and at No 41. The alignment would be close to the window arrangement below. The neighbouring abutting roof has had works undertaken and there would be some degree of balance. The French doors would be markedly below ridge height.
6. Whatever the planning histories the fact remains that many properties locally have had roof alterations and this has become embedded in the nature of the locality which is not a Conservation Area but remains characterful. I see no appreciable diminution of the quality of the locality as a result of the appeal scheme and I can understand why the Appellant would wish to improve the internal quality of the accommodation in this way. In summary, the appeal scheme would not be jarring on the eye; it would be suitably subservient to the host property when seen as a whole and would be relatively innocuous in this terraced scene.
7. The Lambeth Local Plan 2015 includes Policies Q5 and Q11 which are relevant. Taken together and amongst other matters, they call for high quality design of extensions sympathetic to, and in subordinate scale with, the original building and its wider setting and protective of the streetscene, local distinctiveness and character generally. I conclude that the appeal scheme would not run contrary to these policies. It would also not conflict with the parallel pertinent aesthetic objectives of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Alterations and Extensions (2015); this document could not be expected to cover every detailed eventuality.

Conditions

8. The Council reasonably suggests the standard commencement condition along with a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans as this provides certainty. The suggested condition requiring the use of matching materials is not necessary as intended materials are clearly set on the application form.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace, or the wider locality. Accordingly the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR