



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 June 2021 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MIEMA CEnv AssocRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/21/3270147

2 Chalford Road, London SE21 8BX

- 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 Annie Cleghorn against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 20/03529/FUL, dated 15 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the side extension and rear outrigger and erection of a 2-storey side and rear extension and new rear opening including a new access garden gate¹.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken 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 effects of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No.2 a two-storey end of terrace dwelling located on Chalford Road in Norwood area of London. The terrace block comprises nos. 2 to 16 Chalford Road and the properties each feature a single storey rear outrigger. These outriggers are symmetrically paired with the neighbouring property. That is, 2 and 4, 6 and 8, 10 and 12, 14 and 16. There have been some extensions to the rear on the adjacent terrace block fronting Clive Road. Specifically, 2A and B Chalford Road and 72 Clive Road, which in some sense appears to alter the symmetry at the rear of these properties. It is noted that these properties are used for commercial and business
5. Nevertheless, the symmetry at the rear of the block which the appeal property is part of has been maintained. Similarly, there is a high degree of symmetry on the front elevations of the properties at 2-16 Chalford Road, all of which are

¹ Taken from decision letter based on 3.1.12 of appellant letter dated March 2021

attractive double fronted properties with windows set either side of centrally placed doorways. The pleasing uniformity of the properties adds significantly to the character and appearance of the area. The introduction of a two-storey side and rear extension on the northern elevation would severely unbalance the symmetry, producing an awkward form of development. It would appear dominant when view on Chalford Road and would detract from the quality of the appeal property and the contribution it makes to the block.

6. The appellant argues that the existing single-storey side extension already creates an imbalance to the symmetry. However, the existing single storey extension is of a small scale, which appears as an ancillary storage shed which is clearly subservient in scale and does not dilute the overall symmetry of the property. In comparison, the combined bulk and width of the two storey wrap around would not be subordinate to the host dwelling by virtue of its massing. This would be visually harmful to the appearance of the host property and the block on account of the scale of the addition and the resultant loss of symmetry.
7. Furthermore, the proposal would introduce an alien roof form. It would appear as an apex roof with long slopping frontage. Although the gable end would face the street, as in the existing row, the profile of the roof would be completely at odds with the simple pitched roof of the original property. This form would be visible on Chalford Road as it forms the side elevation would be the external wall and would appear as an incongruous addition to the street scene. Whilst the extension has been set back from the front with a lowered roof height in an attempt to achieve a subservient extension, the result is a somewhat contrived arrangement where the external profile fails to respond to the very strong sense of symmetry of the original property and the distinctive character of the row as a whole.
8. The appellant argues that the proposed extension would not substantially infill the gap between the host property and 2A Chalford Road. This is because they consider that the existence of dense evergreen shrubs above the trellis and fence form a solid and permanent structure in the same way as the flank wall of the proposed extension will be a solid and permanent structure in the same location. However, in contrast to the proposed gable end, the greenery provides a soft break from the built form which contributes to the quality of the street. The removal of that sense of greenery and its replacement with a substantial wall directly adjacent to the boundary would therefore have a negative visual impact.
9. Taking all the above points together, I find that the proposal by virtue of its siting, massing and design would be visually harmful and would have a negative effect upon the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. Accordingly, it would conflict with the objectives of Policies Q5 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) (the 'LP'). These seek amongst other things to ensure that alterations or extensions of buildings have a design which positively responds to the original architecture, roof form, detailing, fenestration (including design, materials and means of opening) of the host building and other locally distinct forms (such as group characteristics).

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR