



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2023

by Joanna Gilbert MA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/22/3295772

Top Floor Flat, 8 Rattray Road, London SW2 1BD.

- 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 Waad Darzi of WD Architecture against the decision of London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 21/04675/FUL, dated 2 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is construction of a rear loft dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Located on the southern side of Rattray Road close to the junction with Mervan Road, the appeal building at 8 Rattray Road is a two-storey mid-terraced building with a large rear outrigger over three storeys. The building has previously been extended at ground floor level and consists of two flats. The appeal relates to the flat arranged across the upper two floors of the building.
4. The proposed development is for a rear dormer extension to the full width of the building's main rear roofslope and the insertion of three rooflights. One rooflight would be located on the roof of the rear dormer extension, while the other rooflights would be located close to the ridgeline of the front roofslope.
5. Policy Q5 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2021)(LLP) seeks to sustain and reinforce local distinctiveness. It supports development which takes a creative, innovative and contextual design approach and considers townscape character, built form, quality and architectural detailing. LLP Policy Q8 confirms that the council will seek to ensure that proposed building designs and submitted details are buildable and visually attractive. LLP Policy Q11 deals with building alterations and extensions. Amongst other things, it expects proposals to positively respond to the original architecture, roof form, detailing, fenestration of the host building and other locally distinct forms. New dormers should be subordinate to retain the roof as the dominant element in the composition, and should also be of appropriate design, detailing and materials.

6. The Council's Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (SPD) confirms that where traditional examples of dormers exist, they are modest and of simple, robust appearance. It confirms that the loss of these examples will be resisted on prominent roof slopes. It asserts that many more modern dormers in Lambeth are unfortunately bulky and poorly detailed. The SPD states that the introduction of new dormers requires a careful approach, to ensure compatibility with the main building and their wider context, and that large, insubordinate, box dormers are rarely acceptable. The SPD also confirms that rooflights are generally not an original feature of Lambeth's traditional buildings, and that they should be subordinate features, aligned with windows and other features below.
7. The proposed rear dormer would involve the removal of the rear main roofslope and its replacement with a full width box dormer. Although it would not be visible from the street, it would be unduly dominant and would fail to be subordinate to the remainder of the building's rear elevation. Furthermore, the rear face of the dormer would be largely blank and windowless with the exception of the proposed glazed doors and Juliet balcony, which would fail to be subordinate to the windows on the building below. Additionally, the proposed front rooflights would be of differing sizes and would not align with the windows below. When taken together, the scale, form, massing and detailed design of the proposed development would be detrimental to the host building and the wider area.
8. The appellant has referred to examples of larger dormer extensions on Rattray Road, Dalberg Road and Mervan Road. The Council has confirmed that its records show that the majority of the properties on Rattray Road have undertaken works under permitted development rights. As the appeal property is a flat, it does not benefit from permitted development rights and planning permission is required. As such and notwithstanding the appellant's desire to match the appearance of the neighbouring extensions at 6 Rattray Road and nearby extensions carried out to houses, it is necessary for me to assess the proposed development in the context of national and local planning policy.
9. I note the support from a neighbouring occupier. While the proposed development would provide a larger residential unit more suitable for family accommodation, this does not outweigh my concerns about the effect of the proposed development on the area's character and appearance.
10. In conclusion, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would not comply with LLP Policies Q5, Q8, and Q11 and the SPD as set out above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Joanna Gilbert

INSPECTOR