



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2023

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/22/3303554
13 Kirkstall Road, London SW2 4HD

- 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 and Mrs Tony and Kate Morrison against the decision of The London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref:22/01292/FUL dated 08 April 2022 was refused by notice dated 01 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing single storey extension and replacement with a new single storey ground floor rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing single storey extension and replacement with a new single storey ground floor rear and side extension at 13 Kirkstall Road, London SW2 4HD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 22/01292 dated 08 April 2022 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PP-01; PP-02; PP-03; PP-04; PP-05; PP-06; PP-07; PP-08.
 - 3) No development above ground level shall be carried out unless and until samples of all external materials, including a panel of facing brickwork, have been made available to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the Telford Park Conservation Area (Conservation Area).

Reasons

3. The appeal site, 13 Kirkstall Road (No.13) is a substantial three-storey semi-detached, unlisted, house. Dating from the late Victorian period No.13 lies within the Telford Park Conservation Area which is characterised by its harmonious, but not uniform, development of housing. I note that, notwithstanding their broadly similar single storey rear outriggers, and although referred to by the Council as a pair (with No.15) and being 'largely

symmetrical'; these two houses differ in several respects including frontage width, the large side projection of No.13 and, therefore, of internal layout. In particular I note that such variation is an identified characteristic of the CA referred to in the Conservation Area character assessment, consequently I attribute little weight to the purported symmetry of these houses. Further, whilst the rear extension would attach to the full width the main block of No.13, the original ground floor side wing adds significant width and creates a different context to the desirability or otherwise of 'full width' extensions.

4. The appellant points to a number of approved rear alterations at the rear of nearby properties, intending to reconfigure and update the internal arrangement of the house but, in particular, to replace the rear single-storey wing which would remove some elements of the original building including a ground storey canted bay which lights an inner room in the middle of the house. For their part, the Council confirm that part of the rear extension to be removed is not original fabric but also suggests that there have been works to the adjoining pair, No.15, which may have removed similar elements.
5. Turning to the design of the proposal, Policy Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2021 (LLP) sets out criteria for extensions and alterations, stressing the importance of subordination to the host building. Policy Q5 of the LLP indicates support for proposals which demonstrate design excellence and make a positive contribution to context.
6. In this case it is apparent that care has been taken to ensure a high quality individual design which remains, despite its increased width from the original rear wing, subordinate to its host in the sense that it does not diminish the status or distinctive form of the original house nor would it dominate the garden setting. Consultee objections, in the face of dissatisfaction with the design proposal, go so far as to suggest architectural measures such as the use of glazing and monopitch roofs that might make the proposal acceptable. Although such comments may seek to reflect policy and guidance, the achievement of high quality design which positively addresses its context requires an approach which coherently, and in the case of works which have the potential to affect heritage assets sensitively, addresses the problem presented. To my mind, such coherence and sensitivity is evident in the submitted design by its use of materials, the relationship with the boundary and a roof form in two parts which addresses the 'waisting' of the footprint to reflect something of what it intends to replace.
7. The Council's refusal reason directly associates their concerns as to the impact of the proposal on the host building with harm to the character and appearance of the CA. Change to a single unlisted building within a conservation area cannot be presumed to cause wider harm but is a matter for specific assessment, to which I now turn.
8. The distinctive character of the Conservation Area derives substantially from its history and the resultant development pattern which is most plainly represented in its overarching layout and built forms, the relationship of houses to the street and, notwithstanding the variation in built forms, a consistency of architectural detailing. However, whilst the proposal would remove a small element of original fabric at the rear and introduce new fabric, this would, by virtue of its discrete positioning, have little or no impact upon these primary attributes of

the Conservation Area. Although the proposal would change the character and appearance of the host dwelling from certain secondary viewpoints within the Conservation Area, these would be subsumed by the dominant mass of existing built form aided by intervening trees; I consider no harm would arise to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area itself from such limited change.

9. I therefore conclude that, for the reasons given and having taken into account all matters raised that the proposal would not conflict with policies Q5, Q11 and Q22 of the LLP or with the Lambeth Building Alterations and Extensions SPD (2015) or, on that basis, with the development plan as a whole. For these same reasons I further conclude that, having regard to the duty set out in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, that the proposal would not fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In consequence the appeal succeeds subject to the usual plans and timing conditions together with a condition to ensure the materials employed harmonise with the host building and preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR