



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2023

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6TH March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/22/3312817

52 Canmore Gardens, Lambeth, SW16 5BD.

- 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 R. Omar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 22/02935/FUL, dated 15 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as erection of roof extension in front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property and the terrace of which it is part.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 52 Canmore Gardens is one house in a long terrace of two-storey houses. Due to the topography of the site at this end of the terrace the houses step up in pairs to reflect the change in level.
4. The appellant proposes the construction of a new pitched roof dormer and the insertion of a new rooflight to the street facing front roof slope.
5. Policy Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (Adopted September 2021) (LP) addresses building alterations and extensions. Amongst other things the policy expects, at criterion A (i): *proposals to have a design which positively responds to the original architecture, roof form, detailing, fenestration (including design, materials and means of opening) of the host building and other locally distinct forms (such as group characteristics); such features should be respected, retained and where necessary on heritage assets authentically reproduced.* Further the Council's Supplementary Planning Document–*Building Alterations and Extensions* (Adopted September 2015) (SPD) advises that dormers will be resisted on front roof pitches.
6. The neighbouring property number 54 has a large box dormer built on its front roof slope, which I note from the evidence does not benefit from planning permission. Otherwise, there are no other front dormers to the houses on either side of the road.

7. In my judgement the proposed dormer as well as appearing as a prominent feature would be an uncharacteristic and incongruous addition to the host property and the terrace of which it is part. The proposed development would therefore cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property, the terrace and the street scene.
8. To allow the proposal would therefore be contrary to the objectives of LP policy Q11 and the advice set out in the SPD, as they, along with other things, relate to the quality of development and the need for extensions to respect the prevailing architecture of the host property and the group.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has referred me to the large dormer at number 54. Whatever the background to that case, and while accepting that the proposed dormer at the appeal site would be smaller and less intrusive the existence of that one dormer on a nearby property is not, in my opinion, an appropriate justification for permitting a further dormer here.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR