



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September by S Wilson LLB MSC LRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/22/3300080

193A Auckland Hill, London SE27 9PD

- 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 Gaetano Marcone against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 22/00041/FUL, dated 6 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion, erection of party walls and roof extension to the front and rear, together with roof lights to the front, and roof light and Juliet balcony with French doors to the rear roof.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The right of appeal is vested in the original applicant. Although the appeal was initially submitted in his wife's name, Mr Gaetano Marcone has confirmed that the appeal can proceed in his name as the original applicant.
4. The appellant has highlighted that planning permission has been sought for similar roof extension schemes at both adjacent properties, Nos 193b and 193d, submitted by a different applicant. However, the appeal before me is for the proposed development at 193a only and I have considered it on that basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is a relatively modern, two-storey property forming one end of a terrace of three dwellings. The ground floors are rendered and painted, whilst the first floors are brickwork. The terrace has a dual pitched roof and each property has a small forward projection with gable and dual pitched roof.
7. The surrounding area is of mixed character, with some commercial property, railway infrastructure and housing in a mixture of architectural styles, including

- both traditional and modern developments. The rising land levels and consequent steps between groups of properties emphasises the differences between the architectural styles and the lack of a dominant form or uniformity.
8. Having viewed the appeal site from both the street and the train line behind, it is apparent that, due to their materials, form and scale, the appeal terrace and nearby modern flats stand out as different amongst the more traditional development and commercial buildings. However, given the mixed character of the area they do not detract from the character and appearance of the area.
 9. The proposal is for a mansard style roof extension to the front and rear. While there are numerous dormers in the area, including box dormers opposite the appeal site, there are no mansard style roof extensions nearby. The modern properties are also conspicuous in their apparent lack of roof extensions. Policy Q11(k) of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (adopted September 2021) (the Local Plan) sets out that mansard roof extensions should not harm the architectural integrity of the original building or its group.
 10. The bulky design of the proposed roof would add mass and scale and significantly alter the form of the simple dual pitched roof form, dominating the host property and unbalancing the terrace. The proposed windows would not be aligned with the fenestration below and the materials would contrast starkly with the rest of the terrace. The proposal would therefore fail to be subordinate to the host dwelling and would not respond positively to the original architecture, building form or design integrity. It would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the contribution of the terrace to the surrounding area.
 11. The appellant has suggested the proposal could be amended to align the windows, were the appeal to be allowed. However, I have no such plans before me and in any case the change would not overcome the impacts of the overall scale and design proposed. Therefore, it would not be reasonable or necessary to secure such amendments through a planning condition.
 12. The appellant suggests that similar development would be undertaken at 193b and 193d, all of which would be constructed together. The evidence before me is that applications for 193b and 193d have been refused and I have not been made aware of any appeals against those refusals. I cannot therefore be certain that planning permission would be granted for the same alterations to the other properties. In any event, even if planning permission were granted for all three, there is no mechanism before me to ensure that they would be constructed at the same time. It would be open to the appellant and the other landowner to make an application for all three properties together, which would be considered on its own merits.
 13. In conclusion, the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would not comply with Policies Q5 and Q11 of the Local Plan, insofar as they require development to be of high-quality design that responds positively to local distinctiveness and the architecture of the host property.

Other Matters

14. The presence of other modern development in the area and their impact on the street scene does not justify the harm that this proposal would cause. There is

no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the roof extension proposed would be more environmentally sound and sustainable than another form of extension or would have less impact on the street scene. While the appellant may prefer to utilise the existing roof space, this would be a private benefit and does not outweigh the harm that would result from extending the roof as proposed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. The proposed roof extension is therefore contrary to the development plan and there are no other material considerations to outweigh this finding. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and agree with the recommendation. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR