



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2022

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/21/3285617

121 Norwood High Street, London SE27 9JF

- 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 Glenscot LTD against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 21/01759/FUL, dated 1 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as ground floor and upper floor extensions and creation of new one-bedroom flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
 - the effect of the proposal on the operation of the highway network with particular regard to parking provision; and
 - whether the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers, with regards to the provision of internal space and access to cycle parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal building is a single storey property situated at the end of a short terrace comprised of two storey properties. The proposal would be finished in white painted render. There is a wide variety of materials in the street scene, with several examples of rendered buildings, including those immediately adjacent to the appeal building. The proposed use of render would therefore reflect the character of the area. I am not convinced that this would not be an appropriate or durable material.
4. I note that the proposal does not strictly comply with each principle for mansard extensions as set out in The Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (September 2015), namely in relation to materials, window arrangement and the roof pitch.

5. With regards to the lack of lead flashings and use of stock brick, notwithstanding the above regarding the use of render, these matters could be appropriately conditioned. I also consider that the arrangement of the windows would align satisfactorily with the lower levels. Although section drawings at an appropriate scale have not been provided, it seems to me that internal head height within the upper floor would also be sufficient.
6. Whilst there are no existing mansard extensions on the host terrace, the SPD also seeks to ensure that these additions are subordinate features to the host building. The proposed mansard extension would have a flat roof, with a single pitch to the front, rather than two lower and two upper pitches. To the rear, it would be flush with the elevations below and it would have a full gable end rather than a subservient half-hipped design. By virtue of these factors, the mansard would appear as an additional full storey rather than a subservient addition.
7. Although the proposal seeks to reflect other mansards in the locality, I am not convinced that the single pitch to the front would result in a lower profile or reduced mass and volume than a mansard which follows the advice of the SPD. Furthermore, the other examples are less prominent, as they appear to have a greater set back behind a parapet, whereas the proposed mansard extension would rise from it. Collectively, the above factors would give the proposal an obtrusive and overly dominant appearance.
8. Accordingly, by virtue of the proposed mansard's overall size, scale and design, it would not be a subordinate feature of the host building and thus would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies Q5 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (September 2021) (the LLP) which seek to ensure that developments respond positively to the host building and reflect the built form in the locality.

Parking

9. Policy T6 of the LLP requires that developments are permit free where the development has a Transport for London's Public Transport Access Levels (PTAL) of 4-6 and/or where the development falls within an existing or planned controlled parking zone. This policy also requires the provision of car club memberships for new residential development.
10. The appeal site is located in an area with good public transport accessibility (PTAL score of 4). It is not however located within a controlled parking zone (CPZ). The Council has nevertheless indicated that it has an ongoing CPZ expansion programme in the borough. At the time of my site visit I observed that most on-street parking spaces on the surrounding streets were occupied. My observations, whilst just a snap-shot in time, along with the Council's intimation regarding a future CPZ, suggest that there is a high level of on-street parking stress in the locality and that spaces are at a premium.
11. The proposed development does not include any off-street parking provision. It would therefore generate further demand for the already limited on-street spaces, thus exacerbating the existing pressure on parking in the area. By virtue of the appeal site's good levels of accessibility and the high level of on-street parking stress, the proposed development should be car-free. There is no mechanism before me, or any condition which I could reasonably attach, to

ensure this could be achieved. The proposal also fails to make provision for a car club membership.

12. In the absence of a suitable mechanism to ensure that the proposal is a car-free development and makes provision for a car club membership, future occupiers would be more likely to use private vehicle than sustainable forms of transport thus the proposal is likely to increase the already high pressure on parking on the surrounding streets.
13. Policy T7 is referenced within the Council's decision notice however this concerns servicing and thus is not relevant to this main issue. However, within the Council's evidence reference is made to Policy T6 of the LLP, which I consider to be the relevant policy. The proposal would conflict with this policy, which seeks to promote a sustainable travel pattern and address congestion through the control and management of parking.

Living conditions

14. There is dispute between the main parties regarding the size of the internal floor area that the proposal would provide. The appellant states that the proposal would meet the minimum gross internal floor area as set out in Policy H5 of the LLP and Policy D6 of The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London March 2021 (the London Plan). These standards reflect the nationally described space standards.
15. The Council consider that the proposal would fall short of the minimum requirement. The differences between the disputed floor area figure are limited. However, no explanation is given as to how the Council has measured the floorspace. Even taking into consideration the Council's lower figure, which falls marginally short of the requirement, it seems to me that the proposal would provide dual aspect habitable rooms of good proportions, generous size and a functional layout so as to accommodate a useable layout of all furniture required for day-to-day living.
16. Although detailed section drawings have not been provided, the submitted plans include sufficient detail to determine that floor to ceiling heights within the upper floor would be sufficient.
17. Whilst the proposed cycle storage area would be to the rear of the building, it would nevertheless be in an accessible and convenient location given the building's end of terrace siting and the very close relationship between the entrance to the flat and side door to the storage area. Future residents would therefore be likely to utilise this space and thus be encouraged to cycle.
18. Taking all the above into consideration, the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers. Even if the proposal was in minor conflict with the standards, it would nevertheless accord with the aims of Policy D6 of the London Plan and Policies Q2, Q13 and H5 of the LLP, which collectively seek to ensure that developments protect the amenity of future occupants through the provision of high-quality living accommodation, along with accessible cycle storage, amongst other things.

Conclusion

19. The proposal would provide a new dwelling in an accessible location. There would be some accompanying benefits associated with the investment and

employment in the construction of the dwelling and from the spending in the local area from future occupants. However, due to the small scale of the proposal, these benefits would be limited.

20. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole and the other considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison

INSPECTOR