



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2023

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/22/3312456

105C Tulse Hill, Lambeth, London SW2 2QB

- 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 Kyung Lee Hun against the decision of the London Borough of Lambeth Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03545/FUL, dated 3 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is a front pitched roof dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front pitched roof dormer at 105C Tulse Hill, Lambeth, London SW2 2QB in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 22/03545/FUL, dated 3 October 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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 Issues

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair of houses, of which the appeal dwelling forms part, and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a semi-detached two storey house with a hipped roof that forms part of a group of 4 similar semi-detached houses on Tulse Hill. These are set back from the road behind long and generously proportioned front gardens. The appeal dwelling and its semi-detached pair at 105B Tulse Hill (No.105B) form a focal point when approaching Tulse Hill from Craginair Road and make a substantial contribution to the streetscene of the local area.
4. The appeal property and No.105B share a hipped roof form, but do not have symmetrical front elevations, with No.105B having a front gable feature. However, the semi-detached pair of the appeal property and No.105B do have a symmetrical visual relationship with their neighbouring semi-detached pair.

5. The proposal is for a traditionally formed pitched roof dormer window to the front roof slope. This would sit above and align with the existing first floor rounded bay window. The proposed dormer would be set well in from the roof edge, ridge and side roof hip. The proposal would appear to match the materials used in the external surfaces of the appeal dwelling and would complement the fenestration pattern and hierarchy of the existing front elevation.
6. Within the context of the appeal dwelling, the position of the proposal on the front roof pitch, its scale, design and materials would result in the proposal appearing as a complementary and subordinate addition. Given that the proposal would not significantly interrupt the roof form or profile of the semi-detached pair with No.105B, and the asymmetrical front elevations of these two properties, the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of this semi-detached pair. This includes when viewed from along Tulse Hill in immediate and wider views, and from the view of the appeal dwelling and its semi-detached pair from Craignair Road.
7. Although the proposal would be an asymmetrical addition to the group of four semi-detached houses, it would be a small scale addition that would not interrupt the hipped roof profiles or major symmetrical gable features. Although the Council have stated that the proposal would constitute a poor development precedent for the group, I have considered the proposal on its own individual merits.
8. I find that the proposal would be well designed and detailed, respectful and compatible with the character of the existing building and wider context, and would not, therefore, be detrimental to its appearance and the wider roofscape. On this basis the proposal would accord with the design guidance set out in paragraphs 4.3 and 4.4 of the Council's Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2015).
9. For these reasons I do not find that the proposal would result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair of houses, of which the appeal dwelling forms part, or to that of the local area.

Conditions

10. As well as the standard condition for the timing of implementation and to maintain the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area, I have included a condition requiring that the materials to be used match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

11. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR