



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 August 2021

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/21/3272163

313a Cavendish Road, Balham, London, SW12 0PQ

- 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 Amelia McLinden against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 21/00071/FUL, dated 7 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear mansard and balcony over back addition roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a first floor flat in a 2 storey, double pitched roofed, terraced house converted into 2 flats. The rear roofs of houses in the terrace are defined by low parapets following the roof line. 2 storey outriggers with shallow pitched roofs extend from the rear of them. Their roof ridges join the main houses at approximately eaves height such that they appear subordinate to them. Several properties in the terrace have rear roof extensions on the main roof plane, although most roofs remain relatively unaltered.
4. The proposed development, although described as including a rear mansard, would comprise a flat roof extending from just below the roof ridge, out from the roof plane, and then down in a steep pitch to just above eaves level. It would cover the full width of the roof. A rear flat roofed dormer would extend from it, just below its upper flat roof, and out to meet where the proposed sloping roof ends above the eaves. It would also cover the full width of the roof. Part of the outrigger roof would be removed, where it meets the building, to make way for a roof terrace which would be accessed from steps leading down from a door in the proposed rear dormer. A 1.8 metre obscured glazed balcony would surround the terrace and be visible above the remainder of the outrigger roof.
5. Policy Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) (LP) refers to subordination being key when considering extensions. Rear dormers should be below the ridge and

set in from the sides and eaves so that the original roof remains the dominant element. However, the Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (SPD) suggests that mansard roofs are the best option on traditional properties with double pitched roofs such as the appeal property. Figure 10 provides an illustrative example wherein the whole rear roof would be replaced by a mansard roof with two rear dormers.

6. The proposed development is a hybrid of the 2 designs. It incorporates elements of a mansard roof, but these would be largely hidden behind the dormer from most views of the rear of the building. The original roof plane would be obscured by the proposed development, with only the ridge remaining visible. As such it would dominate, rather than be subordinate to, the existing roof. Furthermore, Policy Q11 resists roof level balconies unless they are characteristic of the host building, or group of buildings of which it is part of. I saw no roof balconies on houses within the terrace. The SPD also advises that roof extensions over rear outriggers will generally be resisted. As noted above, the proposed roof terrace would replace part of the outrigger roof and the proposed balcony would be raised over it. As a result, the balcony would appear as an incongruous and dominant addition visible above the outrigger roof.
7. Overall, the proposed development would dominate the roof of the host property and be out of character with the roofscape in the vicinity of the appeal site. It would therefore harm the character and appearance of both the host building and wider area and conflict with Policies Q2, Q5, Q8 and Q11 of the LP, and the SPD, which support visually attractive development which responds to the local context, including roofscapes.

Other Matters

8. Whilst I note that the appeal site is not in a conservation area (CA), as highlighted by the appellant, character and appearance remain important considerations outside of CAs. The appellant has referred to Permitted Development (PD) rights that would have been available had the building not been converted into flats, and to other buildings nearby which have similar extensions, particularly those within the neighbouring Council area. None of the roof extensions that I saw on properties within the same terrace as the appeal site were comparable. The approach a neighbouring Council may have taken regarding similar proposals does not alter my opinion that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm. In terms of PD rights, as the proposed development incorporates a balcony, and due to its height above the eaves, it would not have been permitted development if the property had been a house rather than a flat. As such I accord these matters negligible weight.
9. I appreciate that the proposed balcony would provide external amenity space that is currently lacking at the flat, however, in this case, I do not think the benefits of such provision outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR