



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2022

by David English BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/22/3294131

69 Glencairn Road, London SW16 5DG

- 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 JM & S Degioanni against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 21/04360/FUL, dated 9 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion involving the erection of a rear mansard dormer roof extension over main roof and existing outrigger and a new external staircase.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion involving the erection of a rear mansard dormer roof extension over main roof and existing outrigger and a new external staircase at 69 Glencairn Road, London SW16 5DG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/04360/FUL, dated 9 November 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; 4456/EF; 4456/PFP; 4456/EE; and 4456/PE.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. Glencairn Road is a quiet suburban residential street comprising blocks of terraced houses and flats. Dwellings are set back a short distance from the highway with small front gardens bounded mainly by low brick walls in the vicinity of the appeal site. Interest and colour are provided by several small street trees. A pleasing rhythm to the appearance of the street is provided by the simple but elegant detailing around doors and windows, two storey bay

windows with pedimented gables, the impressive chimney stacks, and the external finishes to walls and roofs.

4. The appeal property sits within the long terrace of flats which occupy the portion of the street before its junction with Ellison Road. Access to the rear of the appeal property is provided through a narrow private gated alley running alongside the end terraced property, 59 Glencairn Road. This alley leads into a substantial grassed private communal area containing a wide variety of trees of varying sizes. I saw that access to this area is available only through that private alley and from individual gated accesses to the rear yards of the flats on Glencairn Road. It provides a significant degree of separation between the rear of the flats and the rear gardens of houses on Hepworth Road.
5. The rear elevations to the terrace are finished in yellow brick with red brick detailing to window heads. These are much simpler than the impressive front elevations, but a common overall appearance is provided to the rear elevations when seen collectively. The main distinguishing feature of the flats when viewed from the private communal area is the substantial hipped roof outriggers. These appear to cover almost the full width of each plot, leaving only narrow gaps separating their side walls from the common boundaries. However, these outriggers alter in width, having a return which results in them being significantly narrower closest to the main building, primarily to accommodate the width of windows in the main rear elevations.
6. The proposed development would comprise an 'L' shaped mansard. The larger part of the proposal would replace the existing rear roof slope. The Council has assessed this element of the proposal against their Building Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (September 2015) ('the SPD') and confirm in their Statement of Case that it would comply with policies in the Lambeth Local Plan 2020 – 2035 (September 2021) ('the Local Plan'). The Council's main objection concerns the smaller part of the proposed mansard which would return from the main part of the appeal property and would sit over part of the outrigger.
7. This smaller part of the proposal would sit above the shorter, narrower part of the outrigger. This arrangement, along with its lower height than the proposed mansard to the existing main rear roof, would result in this element of the proposal being subordinate in stature and appearance to the host property when the design of the proposal is taken as a whole. While this may be different to rear mansard and dormer extensions that I saw nearby, including those in this part of the terrace, this arrangement would be visually concordant in the same way that the outrigger, despite its overall size, appears subservient to the main building because of the stepped roof design. The design of the proposal would therefore not harm the architectural integrity of the host building or the terrace, neither of which are identified as heritage assets, nor are they located in, or within the setting of, any designated heritage assets.
8. Partial views of the proposed mansard on the rear outrigger could be achieved from first floor bedroom windows and from dormer extension windows in houses along Hepworth Road to the rear of the appeal site. However, those views would be from some considerable distance away, and they would be interrupted intermittently by various mature trees and hedges along the rear garden boundaries of those houses, and by those trees in the private communal area. Further, from what I saw during my site visit, direct views of

the proposed mansard above the outrigger could realistically only be achieved in a small handful of houses on Hepworth Road through a very narrow arc of vision. This is because the proposal would be obscured from view for the most part by the larger portions of the outriggers to those buildings at either side of the appeal property.

9. I saw that it would be very difficult to achieve views of that part of the proposal above the outrigger from any part of the private communal area, due mainly to the dominance in all lines of vision of the wider parts of the outrigger at the appeal property and the outriggers at neighbouring flats. It is therefore likely that direct views of this part of the proposal would only be afforded from the immediately adjoining first floor flat where windows face towards the proposal.
10. No part of the proposal would be visible from Glencairn Road whose characteristic features would be unaffected by the proposed development. The proposal would not be seen from any other public vantage point. Views of the proposal may be afforded to adjoining neighbours, and some more limited views from distance in the upper rear windows of houses on Hepworth Road. However, in this case I have concluded that the design of the proposal would not harm the architectural integrity of the host building or the terrace. I therefore conclude that proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area.
11. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of either the host property or the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policies Q5 and Q11 of the Local Plan in that it sustains and reinforces local distinctiveness, positively responds to the original architecture of the host building and terrace and would not harm their architectural integrity. The proposal also accords with the SPD.

Conditions

12. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council and, in the interests of clarity, have made some minor alterations to those. The conditions I have set out are necessary to ensure commencement within statutory time limits, in the interests of certainty on the plans approved, and to ensure the character and appearance of the area is not harmed by the materials used in the construction of the development.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David English

INSPECTOR