



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2022 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MRTPI MIEMA CEnv

Decision by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/22/3298719

6 St Michael's Road, London SW9 0SL

- 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 & Mrs Lewis against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 22/00545/FUL, dated 15 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is refurbishment of the property involving erection of a part rear extension at upper ground floor, installation of new glazed patio doors to the existing lower ground floor rear extension, the replacement of all windows with timber traditional sliding sash windows, the replacement of 2 small sash first floor rear windows with 1 larger sash window, and the replacement of the rear door, together with erection of 2 rear dormer windows and the installation of 2 front roof lights. Installation of front railings and new handrails to the steps at the front of the property and increasing the lightwell area to front and rear lower ground floor¹.
-

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 Matters

3. There is an extant planning permission² for certain parts of the appeal before me, namely: 'of a new glazed patio doors to the existing lower ground floor rear extension, replacement of all windows with white timber traditional double glazed sash windows, replacement of 2 small rear sash windows at first floor with a larger sash window, together with erection of 2 rear dormer windows and installation of 2 front roof lights. Installation of railings and gate to the front of the property and increasing the lightwell area to the front and rear.'
4. As such, those elements already permitted are not included in my reasoning and my consideration is only regarding the part of the proposal in dispute, which is involving erection of a part rear extension at upper ground floor.

¹ Description is slightly edited for clarity

² 22/00224/FUL

Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposed erection of a part rear extension at upper ground floor upon the appearance of the host dwelling and whether it would preserve or enhance the character of the Stockwell Park Conservation Area (the 'CA')

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. No.6 is a mid-terrace three-storey dwelling located on St Michael's Road in Stockwell, London. It also includes a basement and a two and half storey rear outrigger which is about half the width of the host property.
7. The CA is characterised by 19th century properties which include detached, semi-detached and terraced properties. The majority of these have generous mature gardens at the rear and a general unaltered appearance. St Michael's Road is particularly characterised by terraced properties, and no.6 is part of a group of three-storey dwellings over basement with front garden. Most of the houses have two-storey rear outriggers which are about half the width of the property. This presents a neat uniform terrace at the rear. The low boundary walls give a wide view to the rear from neighbouring properties, which contributes to how the area is experienced, and thus to the character of the CA.
8. Figure 5 of London Borough of Lambeth's, Building Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2015 (SPD) sets out examples of appropriate forms of extensions for heritage assets, such as locally listed buildings, and buildings in conservation areas. These emphasise the importance of the subordination of an extension to a host property. The SPD also states that glazed infills are the preferred approach for heritage assets.
9. I understand from the appellant, that at one time there had been a single storey conservatory at the rear. Nonetheless, even if I were to take this into account, given that it no longer exists, the proposed rear extension at upper ground floor would be substantially different as it would exceed the depth of the outrigger and would result in a full-width, two storey rear addition. This would not be subordinate to the rear elevation of the host property and would be an incongruent addition to the rear of this relatively unaltered block, which would alter the visual rhythm of the terraced housing. This adverse impact would be compounded by the use of brick. Unlike a glass structure, which would allow the original scale of the outrigger to be legible, it would appear solid and read as a bulky permanent development.
10. The appellant has referred to other proposals granted permission within the area. At 23 Burnley Road, the scheme comprises a different type of extension. That proposal only involved a slight increase in depth of the existing, full-width, lower ground floor extension and is not comparable in scale to the appeal before me.
11. At 206A Brixton Road, the scheme is similar in scale to the existing extension and incorporates a primarily glazed contemporary structure with green roof. As such, it is broadly consistent with the guidance suggested in the SPD.
12. The proposed rear extension would erode the uniform appearance of the block and undermine the quality of uniform scale of the host property and the block of which it forms part, which is characteristic of the CA. Consequently, the proposal would diminish the positive contribution the property makes to the

character and appearance of the CA and harm would be caused to its significance. Although it would not be seen from the street the proposal would be widely visible from the rear and gardens of nearby properties and would reduce the appreciation of the quality of the historic environment within which nearby occupiers reside and how it is experienced by them.

13. Taking all the above into consideration and notwithstanding other references made by the appellant, and in line with paragraphs 199-202 of the Framework, I would regard the harm as less than substantial. This requires me to weigh it against the public benefits of the proposal.
14. The harm caused is less than substantial, nevertheless it is of considerable importance and weight. Improvements to the property to create additional living space attract limited weight as a private benefit to the appellant. Therefore, on this basis, it is not considered that there are demonstrable public benefits that would outweigh the identified harm to the significance of the CA.
15. Consequently, I find that the erection of a part rear extension at upper ground floor would adversely impact on the appearance of the host property and fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA insofar as it relates to this appeal. Accordingly, the scheme conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies Q11(a)(i), (b), (e)(i) - (iii) and (f) and Q22 (a)(i) of the Lambeth's Local Plan 2020-2035 (Adopted September 2021) and relevant Key Principles of the SPD which amongst other things seek to ensure that proposals affecting conservation areas preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas.
16. The Council have referred to Policy Q15(b)(i) in their reason for refusal. This policy is regarding boundary treatments which I do not consider to be relevant to this appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Louise Nurser

INSPECTOR