



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/22/3313555

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 22/03548/FUL, dated 3 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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 two storey detached house with a hipped roof that forms part of a small group of semi-detached houses on Tulse Hill that are set back behind long and generously proportioned front gardens. The appeal dwelling and its semi detached pair at 105B Tulse Hill 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 proposal is to extend the roof space of the appeal dwelling through a roof extension, which would alter its roof form from a hipped to a gable end. The appellant has set out in their statement that this would allow them to create what they believe would be a more functional loft extension and to facilitate the maintenance of the roof, due to what they regard as limited access due to the proximity of the neighbouring property.
5. The appeal proposal follows the previous issuing of a Certificate of Lawful Development (the CLD) for a loft extension that includes alteration and extension of the existing roof form to create a half hipped roof form.
6. Both the appeal dwelling and its semi-detached pair have hipped roof forms, without gable ends to their flank sides. The proposal would, therefore, result in an unbalanced appearance to this semi-detached pair. The appeal dwelling

would, therefore, appear incongruous within this semi-detached context and within the context of the small group of similar semi-detached properties. As such, the proposal would harm the design integrity and spatial character of the appeal dwelling and its semi-detached pair that share a hipped roof form, and would not accord with the design advice in paragraph 4.22 of the Council's Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2015).

7. This unbalanced appearance would be apparent in street views of the semi-detached pair from along Tulse Hill. It would, however, be particularly apparent in the views of the pair from Craginair Road, where the harmonious, balanced and cottage like appearance of the pair of dwellings make a significant contribution as a terminating focal point in the streetscene and to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The recently issued CLD would allow for a partial change from a fully hipped to a half hipped roof form, which would extend the flank wall of the appeal dwelling. Whilst this would result in an unbalanced appearance between the appeal dwelling and its semi-detached pair, it would not be to the degree that would result from the proposal, and the CLD extension forms a legitimate fallback position for the appellant.
9. Whilst I acknowledge that the appellant feels that the proposal would make for a more functional extension and allow for the ease of roof maintenance, similar roof forms and separating distances to neighbouring buildings are a commonplace feature in residential areas. Such benefits are, however, predominantly of a private nature.
10. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair of which the appeal dwelling forms part and to that of the local area. This would be contrary to policies Q5, Q8 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2021), which seek development, including extensions, that is of high-quality design, positively, sustains and reinforces local distinctiveness and responds to original architecture.

Conclusion

11. As no public benefits of the proposal have been brought to my attention that would outweigh the harm identified, the appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR