



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/21/3279966
13 Norfolk House Road, London SW16 1JJ

- 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 and Mrs Rowley against the decision of London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 21/01481/FUL, dated 12 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a rear roof terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Appeal decisions must be based on the policies from the development plan prevailing at the time of determination. Policies Q2, Q5, Q8 and Q11 from the Lambeth Local Plan (September 2015) and Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan 2020 referred to on the Decision Notice have been superseded by equivalent policies from the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (LP) (adopted 22 September 2021). The appellant is aware of the policies of the LP and has had opportunity to comment upon their relevance to the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal concerns the roof of a three-storey rear return to a mid-terrace house situated to the northern side of Norfolk House Road, which gently slopes down from the east. The houses in the terrace are arranged in symmetrical pairs with the ridge of rear returns positioned on the boundary. The rear roof form of the houses, including the rear returns, is evident in views available from Blakemore Road. Despite the presence of dormer and other extensions to the principal rear roof slopes of the houses, including to No 13, the roofscape of the rear returns evident in those views is generally unaltered. They therefore have a uniform character and appearance that contributes positively to the surrounding area.
5. The application drawings suggest the balustrade wall of the proposed roof terrace would be inset from the roof edges of the rear return and clad in tiles to match the existing roof. The highest part of the terrace would project above the shared ridge between Nos 13 and 15, but below the parapet atop the ridge.

The terrace itself would also not be likely to be visible from Norfolk House Road to the front of the property.

6. Despite all of the above factors, the proposed roof terrace would not be an appropriate, subservient, response to the original roof form, as it would dominate the roof of the rear return. The proposal would therefore appear incongruous in relation to the host property, the wider row of houses, and harmfully disrupt the uniformity of the rear returns.
7. Roof terraces do not appear to be a feature of the local area, but the appellants suggest that loft extensions of rear returns are commonplace. However, I have not been referred to any relevant examples, so it is not possible for me to determine how comparable these would be with the appeal scheme. In any event, I have considered the appeal scheme on its own individual merits and identified it to be harmful.
8. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Hence, the proposal would fail to accord with the design aims of the Building Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (September 2015) and Policies Q2, Q5, Q8 and Q11 of the LP, particularly the latter that seeks to retain rear returns as they are a characteristic of Lambeth.

Other Matters

9. The inner edge of the roof terrace would be inset and this would reduce the possibility of overlooking toward neighbouring properties; and noise and disturbance from the terrace would be likely to be similar to that associated with the use of the appellants' garden. While the Council did not raise concerns in relation to such matters, they would not lead me to a different conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR