



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2021 by Max Webb BA (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/21/3272142

119 Telford Avenue, London SW2 4XW

- 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 D. Routledge against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 20/04096/FUL, dated 25 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion.
-

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 main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located on a corner plot and has two publicly facing elevations, the largest of which fronts a public open area. The publicly facing elevations of the properties in the immediate vicinity of the site are predominantly two-storey, with small gable features and pitched roofs.
5. The proposal seeks to raise the height of the roof on the projection fronting Rastell Avenue, changing the existing pitched roof form to create a mansard style roof. The existing projection is lower than the part of the dwelling fronting Telford Avenue and thus, in terms of height, appears clearly subservient. Even though the mansard style roof would not extend the full length of the property, the raising of the roof height, combined with the steep pitch of the mansard style roof, would increase the scale of this part of the property. Its roof form would be substantially different from those found in the area and would therefore add disproportionate bulk at roof level.
6. The site's location means the proposal would be visually prominent, particularly from Rastell Avenue, Emmanuel Road and the public open space. Whilst there are examples of mansard style roofs and large dormers nearby, these are

situated on parts of the properties that are more hidden from public views than the appeal proposal. The increased scale of the property, with the added bulk at roof level, would also be contrary to the two-storey appearance with associated pitched roofs of many of the visible elevations of properties found in the vicinity of the appeal site. There are three-storey properties fronting the public open space, however the majority of the houses, particularly those in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, have two-storey publicly facing elevations and they are not similar to the appearance the appeal scheme would have.

7. The proposal would contain architectural details and external materials that match the host dwelling, including the retention of the existing gables on the elevation fronting Rastell Avenue. The appellant has suggested that their previous renovation works were completed with respect for the traditional detailing of the property. Whilst this may be the case, it does not minimise the harm that would occur from this appeal scheme.
8. Overall, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies Q2, Q5, Q8 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015), which together aim to ensure the protection of local distinctiveness and good quality design, with regard to the bulk and scale of proposed developments. Policy Q11 in particular suggests roof additions and mansards will not be supported if they cause harm to architectural integrity.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has provided illustrations suggesting a possible extension under permitted development rights. However, the illustrations contain limited details, and there is no formal confirmation on whether the suggested extension would be possible under permitted development rights. It is also unclear whether such a scheme would provide the nature of accommodation desired by the appellant, and therefore whether there is a realistic prospect that it would be implemented. The suggested permitted development scheme is therefore given limited weight in this appeal.
10. It is acknowledged that the appellant sought pre-application advice from the Council. This advice, and the behaviour of the Council during pre-application discussions, does not alter the substantive planning considerations for this development.
11. The desire from the appellant to provide more space and privacy for their children, home working and other activities has been considered. However, it would not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposal would not accord with the Development Plan when it is considered as a whole and when considered in their totality the factors that weigh in favour of the scheme does not outweigh this. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR