



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2021 by A Coombes

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/21/3276852

Site Address 2 Slievemore Close, London SW4 6BZ

- 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 Mrs Olga Sabirova against the decision of the London Borough of Lambeth Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00223/FUL dated 19 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion consisting of hip to gable conversion with rear dormer.
-

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 Matter

3. Since the Council issued their decision notice the Lambeth Local Plan, adopted 2015 has been replaced with the Lambeth Local Plan 2020–2035 (LLP), adopted 2021. This appeal has been considered against the relevant Policies from the updated, and now adopted, plan.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Clapham High Street Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is an unlisted semi-detached house situated on a private, gated road within the Clapham High Street Conservation Area (CHSCA). The house comprises of two storeys and is built in a mix of red and brown brick with a hipped roof that is shared with the adjoining house. The local area is a mix of commercial and residential buildings, most of which are late 18th and 19th century. The application proposes to erect a hip to gable extension which would accommodate a loft conversion and rear dormer.
6. The symmetrical pair of houses, in which the appeal site sits, are of a much more modern design than the surrounding buildings that are characteristic of the CHSCA. The appearance of these buildings conflicts with the general

character of the area. The proposed development would alter the roof form and introduce a dormer that would cause an imbalance between the two properties. It would be large and not be subordinate to the host property. The submitted plans propose the use of matching materials and incorporate some sympathetic design elements, such as being below the existing ridge height and being set in from the eaves. However, the introduction of additional bulk, and resulting imbalance, would exacerbate the already conflicting appearance of the property to the detriment of the CHSCA.

7. On the site visit it was observed that the development would primarily be viewed from properties to the rear of the appeal site and within its immediate context. However, due to the existing degree of overlooking and the raised siting of the proposed dormer, it would be highly prominent from these properties. The extension would be an incongruous addition and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CHSCA.
8. Given that the development would only be seen from a small part of the CHSCA, the harm to it would be less than substantial. Even so, great weight should be given to the conservation of the heritage asset. It is understood that the appellant has expanding accommodation needs. The resulting benefits to the appellant would be private and there would not be any substantive public benefits associated with the proposal to weigh against the harm to the CHSCA. These private benefits, and the absence of objections, carry limited weight and would not outweigh the harm.
9. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and would not preserve or enhance the CHSCA. It would not comply with Policies Q5, Q11 and Q22 of the LLP. Together these Policies require that new development respects local distinctiveness, preserves or enhances conservation areas and, with particular regard to extensions, is subordinate to the host property.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposal would not accord with the Development Plan when it is considered as a whole. For the reasons given above, I recommend the appeal should be dismissed.

A Coombes

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. 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