
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/21/3287925
20 Archbishop's Place, London, SW2 2AJ

- 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 Miss Z Benyounes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 21/02871/FUL, dated 13 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as Demolition of roof. Construction of replacement roof, with rooflights and new dormer at rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of roof. Construction of replacement roof, with rooflights and new dormers at rear at 20 Archbishop's Place, London, SW2 2AJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 21/02871/FUL, dated 13 July 2021.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit the rear dormer had been fully constructed and the proposal is therefore retrospective.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, including on the Rush Common and Brixton Hill Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located within a road comprising similar properties. It is of a simple vernacular, built of yellow stock brick with timber sash windows, a dual pitched slate roof and simple detailing.
5. The appeal site is within the Rush Common and Brixton Hill Conservation Area (CA). It is a linear conservation area which includes much of Brixton Hill and the surrounding area. The area is characterised by layers of development from different historical periods and the stages of development have resulted in three very distinct areas within the CA. The appeal property lies to the east of Rush Common, in an area comprising of artisan housing constructed in the 1850s. Archbishop's Place is an attractive residential street comprising small

two storey, semi detached cottages in a simple vernacular style, set back behind generous country cottage style front gardens.

6. The proposal is for a flat roof linked dormer with two windows on the rear elevation. The dormer has already been constructed. It is set down from the ridge of the dwelling and is also recessed in from the both the shared party wall and the flank wall. It is also set up from the eaves of the dwelling.
7. The Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (SPD) provides useful design guidance in respect of various types of alterations and extensions. It states that in conservation areas where the attics are small and where floor space is limited, the linking of small individual dormers together to make one wider dormer may be an acceptable way of increasing head-room. It advises that care needs to be taken to ensure that the link element is subordinate to the dormers – recessed back from the front of the dormer by one third of the depth of the dormer roof.
8. The proposed dormer does not have a central recessed element as recommended in the SPD. However, it is centrally positioned within the rear roof slope and appears well balanced. It does not appear overly dominant in relation to the existing roof slope given the set back from the shared party wall and flank elevation. It is constructed in matching materials which ensures that it integrates well with the existing dwelling.
9. The windows within the dormer broadly align with the existing fenestration, in accordance with the SPD. I also noted at my site visit that the two windows within the dormer are noticeably smaller than the first-floor window below such that they do not appear overly large or dominant.
10. There are also several examples of dormer extensions in the immediate area which vary considerably in terms of their design and scale and bulk. Whilst several of these dormers include recessed elements in accordance with the SPD, there are other examples of box dormers and pitched roof dormers that do not include any form of recess. I consider that the design of the proposed dormer, including its overall scale, would not be out of keeping with others that have been constructed nearby.
11. The proposed conservation rooflights on the front elevation are small in size and are in keeping with those on the neighbouring dwelling.
12. 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. However, for the reasons outlined above, I am satisfied that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.
13. In conclusion on this main issue, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would preserve the Rush Common and Brixton Hill Conservation Area. Hence, the appeal proposal would satisfy the requirements of the Act,

paragraphs 197 and 199 of the Framework and the design and heritage aims of Policies Q5, Q8, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2021).

Conditions

14. It is not necessary to impose any conditions as the development has already been carried out.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR