



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2021 by C Glaister BSc (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/21/3277673

226 Weir Road, London SW12 0NW

- 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 Zaina Watson against the decision of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 21/01296/FUL, dated 29 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion including the addition of a side facing window at second floor level and 4 no. rooflights to the front roof slope.
-

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.

Procedural Matters

3. The Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 20 July 2021. Regard has been had to the revised national policy as a material consideration in the decision-making process. However, in this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. There is therefore no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework.
4. The Lambeth Local Plan 2020–2035 (LLP20) was adopted on 22 September 2021. The application was originally assessed during the draft stage of this plan, and the LLP20 Policies relevant to the refusal of the development were included in the decision notice. The Council have confirmed that the substance of these Policies remained the same upon the adoption of the LLP20. This development must be considered with regard to the adopted development plan, however, for the above reasons, there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the new local plan.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The site is located towards the eastern end of Weir Road. The southern side of the street is predominantly residential, and whilst most properties form part of

a terraced row, the appeal property forms one half of a semi-detached pair. The building, as a whole, is not symmetrical, and the left side is recessed in comparison to the middle and right side. However, both sides of the building maintain a gabled roof form, and are reflective of one another in this way. The terrace to the right shares a similar roof form at both ends.

7. A fully gabled roof, as proposed, would appear incongruous in relation to the roof at the other end of the building and the roof of the adjacent terrace. The loss of the gabled roof form at 226 Weir Road would create an imbalance in the form of the building as a whole and cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. However, given that this has been confirmed to be permitted development, the report will mainly focus on the dormer proposed at the rear.
8. The proposed dormer would come close to fully occupying the rear roof slope of No 226. Given that neither neighbour immediately adjacent has extended their roof in this way, it would appear particularly incongruous. Oblique views of the dormer would also be possible from Weir Road. Its size would be excessive, including in comparison to the smaller dormer which has been indicated to be permitted development. The windows would also relate poorly to the fenestration below. It would, for these reasons, cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The small degree to which it would be set down from the ridge, back from the eaves, and in from the wall would not sufficiently mitigate its dominating appearance or the harm identified.
9. Whilst there are other examples of rear dormers on other properties nearby, these tend to be located towards the middle of a terraced row, and are not as prominently sited as the one proposed. The appeal is in any case considered with respect to its own individual merits. The external materials used in the construction of the dormer would not mitigate the harm that would arise.
10. The Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) suggests that dormers should be subordinate so that the roof remains the dominant element. For the reasons above, the dormer would not align with the guidance provided in the SPD.
11. For these reasons, the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore fail to comply with Policies Q2, Q5, and Q11 of the LLP20 which together seek to ensure development responds positively to the original roof form and positive aspects of the local context and avoids unacceptably compromising visual amenity.

Other Matters

12. The Council has found no issue relating to the proposed rooflights. These would be minor alterations and there is therefore no reason to disagree with the council on this matter. This would not mitigate the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Glaister

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. 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