



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 31 October 2022

by J Hills MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd November 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/N5660/W/22/3296868

Second Floor Flat, 40 Crewdson Road, London SW9 0LJ

- 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 Liedekerke against the decision of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 21/04076/FUL, dated 19 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion including velux windows to the front. Changes to the windows on the second floor at rear and installation of trellis to the existing roof terrace.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/N5660/W/22/3296871

Second Floor Flat, 40 Crewdson Road, London SW9 0LJ

- 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 Liedekerke against the decision of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 21/04077/FUL, dated 19 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with a pod including velux windows to the front. Changes to the windows on the second floor at rear and installation of trellis to the existing roof terrace.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As set out above there are two appeals on this site. They differ only in the detail of the design of the proposed extensions. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed developments upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is within an established and well-presented terrace of housing, where rear elevation projections and the hipped and pitched roofs above provide a well-proportioned and attractive rhythm of architectural form. This consistency is a positive feature of local character that can be appreciated from the rear aspects of the occupiers of two facing rows of terraces. Other properties in the terrace include rear dormer roof extensions of varying designs and scale that tend to be below the ridge line and set in from the eaves and flanks.
6. The proposed rear extensions would allow continued access to the amenity space provided by the existing roof terrace and would not be seen from the road fronted street scene. However, the full width flat roof projections from ridge height would not be set in from the eaves and flanks and would consume the rear roof slope. As such, the proposals would not be subordinate in scale to the existing roof and would result in unacceptably dominant and incongruous visible features that would not respond positively to the original building or those in the area, eroding consistency.
7. Although the proposed matching materials and front elevation rooflights would be acceptable, the tall and extensive fenestration within Appeal A and projecting pod within Appeal B would be of a scale and design that would harmfully alter the proportions and rhythm of architectural form within the immediate and surrounding area. In this respect, the proposals would not respond to the original architecture of the building or its group.
8. Planning permission has been granted for mansard roofs in the wider area, though these were not visible from the site, and I am not aware of the particular circumstances surrounding those cases. The appellant draws comparisons between the proposed schemes and two appeal decisions relating to mansard roof extensions in the wider area. However, the site-specific circumstances including architectural form and proportions, and the mansard design and scale of these examples is substantially different to the proposed extensions. Consequently, they are materially different to the schemes before me.
9. The Council's reason for refusal refers to the effect of the trellis. However, no trellis is shown on the plans before me and in any event, as I am dismissing the appeal, my findings in relation to the trellis would not alter the outcome of the appeal.
10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposals would cause harm to the character and appearance of the original building and its group, contrary to the design aims of Policies Q5 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (2021), which amongst other things seeks to ensure extensions respond positively to local context, architecture, and are subordinate in scale with the original building and its wider setting.
11. Although guidance set out in Buildings Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document, September 2015 is just that, the schemes would be contrary to its aims to promote good design. Furthermore, the proposals would be in conflict with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to achieve well-designed places.

Other matters

12. Although the proposals would provide improved living space for the occupiers of the host property, as other extensions to nearby properties have done, any such beneficial features would not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the developments would fail to accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations individually or cumulatively that outweigh this. Therefore, the appeals should be dismissed.

J Hills

INSPECTOR

Appendix 1

List of those who have appealed

Reference	Case Reference	Appellant
Appeal A	APP/N5660/W/22/3296868	Liedekerke
Appeal B	APP/N5660/W/22/3296871	Liedekerke