
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2022

By J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/22/3291634

93 Cricklade Avenue, London, SW2 3HE

- 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 Tayo Oyetan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 21/03517/FUL, dated 2 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Erection of a part single, part two storey extension to the rear of the existing semi detached house at 93 Cricklade Avenue, London, SW2 3HE.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building, the semi-detached pair, and the surrounding area including on the Leigham Court Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an attractive two storey semi-detached dwelling located in a row of similar properties. The surrounding group of dwellings are relatively uniform in appearance comprising rough cast with red brick elevations, with broad tile hung gables and distinctive projecting two storey tile hung bay porches on their front elevations. The simple tiled hipped roof is a distinctive feature of the rear elevation of the properties.
4. The Leigham Court Estate Conservation Area (CA) is an early example of a model housing estate comprising long terraces of good-quality, purpose-built flats and houses, constructed on a grid pattern. There is a variety of gothic and classical detailing with minor variations in height and elevational treatment with a limited palette of materials including red and stock bricks with decorative glazed bricks on elevations and boundary walls, clay tiles and terracotta features combined to produce a variety of interesting designs. The appeal property is largely unaltered other than for replacement windows and along with the adjacent semi, makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.

5. The proposed single storey rear extension would extend across the full width of the rear elevation. It would have a height of 3 metres with a flat roof and would have a similar depth to the single storey extensions to the neighbouring dwellings. I concur with the Council that it would be of an appropriate design in relation to the host dwelling and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.
6. The proposed first floor element of the extension would extend across part of the width of the rear elevation and would have a depth of about 1.7m. It would therefore be subservient in scale to the host dwelling.
7. However, in my view, the large prominent gable would be at odds with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would stand out as an incongruous addition to the property. Furthermore, its inharmonious appearance would be accentuated by the angle of the pitch of the roof which would not reflect that of the existing roof structure. The proposed extension would significantly detract from the distinctive hipped roof of the host dwelling and would unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair. Furthermore, it would undermine the uniformity of the group of houses within which it sits.
8. I acknowledge that the proposed extension is to the rear of the property however this does not lessen my concern regarding its effect on the character and appearance of the host property, the semi-detached pair and the surrounding area. Moreover, glimpses of the rear elevations of the dwellings along this part of Cricklade Avenue are obtainable from Faygate Road.
9. I also acknowledge that several of the dwellings in Downton Avenue to the rear of the site have been extended, some at first floor and roof level. However, these dwellings are of a different design and appearance to the appeal property and fall outside of the CA.
10. The statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) is of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 197 of the Framework states, amongst other things, that the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness should be taken into account in determining applications. Paragraph 199 of the Framework also advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation.
11. For the above reasons, the proposal would have a negative effect on the significance of a designated heritage asset and would result in "less than substantial" harm in the words of the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst the proposed would provide enlarged living accommodation, including better provision for home working, no significant public benefits have been put forward to weigh against this harm.
12. In conclusion, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair and the surrounding area. It would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the Leigham Court Estate Conservation Area. Hence, the appeal proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraphs 197 and 199 of the Framework and conflicts with the design and heritage aims of Policies Q2, Q5, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2021) and the Building Alterations and Extensions SPD (2015).

Other Matters

13. With regard to the appellant's comments, I note that highway alignments would not be subject to change and that the imposing built forms and throughfares would remain preserved. The extension would be constructed in matching materials and would not reduce the spatial separation distances between dwellings. Furthermore, I acknowledge that the topography of the site and landscape features would not be affected.
14. However, the above factors, even when taken together, do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR