



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2022 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MIEMA, CEnv

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/21/3287542

7 Mackay Road, London, SW4 0NB

- 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 K Gauld against the decision of London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 21/01953/FUL, dated 17 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a rear mansard roof extension with 2 rear dormer windows.
-

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.
3. Since the planning application was determined, the Council have published the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (Adopted September 2021) (the 'Adopted Local Plan'). Whilst the Decision Notice refers to policy Q2, Q5 and Q11 in the Lambeth Local Plan 2015 and draft policy Q2, Q5 and Q11 in the Draft Revised Lambeth Local Plan 2020, these policies have now been superseded by the same policies in the Adopted Local Plan. In relation to the issues in this appeal, the wording of the policies has not materially changed and I have therefore only referred to the Adopted Local Plan policies in this appeal decision. Both parties were consulted on this approach.

Preliminary Matters

4. The description of the development on the planning application form does not fully describe the proposal. I have taken the wording used on the appeal forms in the above header as it is a more accurate description.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the terrace group.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a two storey, mid-terrace dwelling. The property is part of a terrace of neat and attractive period dwellings with consistent design features. Mackay Road is on a hill and the dwellings step up along the road in

- pairs, the properties feature traditional parapet walls which screen views of the roof at the front of the terrace.
7. The proposal involves a mansard roof extension that would occupy the entire roof slope of the appeal property. No increase in roof height is proposed and it will therefore not be possible to see the roof extension from the front of the terrace due to the existing parapet wall. However, from the rear it would completely alter the roofscape and this change would be visible from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties on Mackay Road and from Redwood Mews.
 8. It appears that none of the other properties in the terrace have been altered at roof level. The addition of development in the form of a substantial mansard roof extension to one part of the terrace would upset its existing uniformity and generally consistent appearance. The positioning and scale of the proposed dormer windows, which would not be aligned or scaled with the existing windows, would create an unbalanced and disproportionate appearance. The roof extension and dormers would be a prominent and incongruous change which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and terrace.
 9. The use of materials and joinery details consistent with the host dwelling and retention of original design features such as chimney stacks the parapet wall and the original windows, would not address the more fundamental issues of scale and design.
 10. I acknowledge that the appeal property and terrace are not designated for their heritage or historic value and are not within a Conservation Area (CA). However, the appeal site is located very close to the boundary of the Wandsworth Road CA, which covers an area of Wandsworth Road immediately to the north of Mackay Road. Whilst I have found harm to character and appearance, the harm would be localised and limited to the host dwelling and terrace group outwith the CA boundary and there would be no harm to the setting of the CA. There would also be no harm to Rectory Grove CA, which is located some distance from the appeal site. The appeal proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CAs.
 11. In conclusion, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and terrace group and be contrary to Policy Q2 and Q5 of the Adopted Local Plan which seek, amongst other things to protect visual amenity and local distinctiveness and design. It is also contrary to Policy Q11 of the Local Plan which seeks, amongst other things to protect architectural integrity and prevent harm to the original building and its group from roof additions and mansards.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

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.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR