



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 21 February 2023

by **E Pickernell BSc MSC MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 April 2023

Appeal A Ref: APP/N5660/D/22/3304624

117 Norwood High Street, Lambeth, LONDON, SE27 9JF

- 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 Caren Hartley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
- The application Ref 22/01213/FUL, dated 4 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2022.
- The development proposed is alterations to the roof structure and replacement of the existing roof to raise the ridge line to create an additional floor to include a loft conversion, with skylights and a raised parapet wall to match that of the adjoining neighbour.

Appeal B Ref: APP/N5660/D/22/3310244

117 Norwood High Street, Lambeth, LONDON, SE27 9JF

- 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 Caren Hartley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
- The application Ref 22/02514/FUL, dated 13 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2022.
- The development proposed is replacement of the existing damaged flat roof to be raised to create an additional floorspace with 3 skylights, with a raised parapet wall to match that of the adjoining neighbours (no. 119).

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As set out above there are two appeals on this site which differ only in the detail of the design of the proposed extensions. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.
4. I have omitted reference to a previous 'draft approval' from the description for Appeal A in the banner heading above as it has been confirmed that the application has not yet been determined. The descriptions for both Appeals contained additional details which related to matters which are not acts of development. I have removed these, even so, I have taken the points raised into account where appropriate.
5. At my site visit I noted that some work has taken place including the raising of the roof. However, I have determined the appeals based on the submitted plans and documents.

Main Issue

6. The main issue common to both cases is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

7. The appeal site is within an area which is characterised by a variety of building types including terraced properties, apartment blocks and commercial buildings.
8. The dwelling is within a terrace of properties which are primarily two storeys with single storey front projections and parapet roofs which give a strong horizontal emphasis and consistency to the front elevations. The rear elevations are more mixed with several extensions of different designs and a variety of roof forms. The appellant considers the architecture to be uninspiring, however the appeal site forms part of a group which contributes to local character through its linear form and the simplicity of the parapet roofs when viewed from the High Street.

Appeal A

9. The proposal includes the provision of an additional storey which would be formed by continuing the original rear elevation vertically to create a new parapet wall at the rear and raising the parapet between 117 and 115 Norwood High Street. Within these parapet walls a pitched roof extension would be constructed.
10. When viewed from the front of the appeal site, the extension would not be readily perceived. The front parapet would be retained and would effectively conceal the pitched roof extension beyond. The rear elevation can be seen from side streets on the east side of the High Street, however views towards the site are partially obscured by the rear extensions of other properties and because the land level drops to the east. Glimpses of the roof extension would be available from the rear, however, it would not appear unduly dominant or incongruous given the variety seen in the immediate context and because it does not exceed the height of the parapet walls. These would be appropriately detailed to create an upstand from the extension which breaks up the mass and reflects the architecture of the original building. As such I find that the proposed roof extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or the area.
11. The proposed privacy screen would be located on top of the ground floor front projection, forward of the first-floor front wall. Its siting and design would break the rhythm of the elevation and would, because of its raised position and forward projection, be a particularly prominent and incongruous feature in the street scene.
12. The appellant has pointed out that the site is not a designated heritage asset, and that the urban block and grain along with some of the features of the building would be undisturbed. Be that as it may the proposed privacy screen fails to respond positively to the distinct context of the site.
13. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal the subject of Appeal A would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policies Q5, Q7, Q8 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020 – 2035 (Adopted September

2021) (LP). Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that development is visually attractive, sustains and reinforces local distinctiveness, responding positively to the original architecture of the building or group. It would also conflict with the Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (September 2015) which seeks to avoid development which would adversely affect the appearance of the building or its contribution to the wider street scene. Furthermore, it would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that development achieves a high standard of design and is sympathetic to local character.

Appeal B

14. Appeal B omits the privacy screening but proposes a roof extension in the same location as Appeal A. However, the design differs in that the extension would have a flat roof which would not be set down from the front and rear parapet walls but would extend to the top of these. This would result in a boxy addition to the roofscape which would fail to respond to the characteristic parapet roof form of the terrace. The lack of parapet detail means the extension would be perceived more readily from the High Street and the poorly detailed design of the extension would detract from the appearance of the dwelling when viewed from both the front and rear.
15. The appellant explains that the revised application sought to clarify the existing nature of the dwelling by amending the drawings from a 'butterfly roof' to a flat roof. A previous Inspector in considering a different scheme which included a mansard roof at 115 – 117 Norwood High Street, referred to the roof as "*a part flat/part 'butterfly roof'*". The appellant contends that the roof was a partially sunken flat roof, however as mentioned above it had been removed at the time of my site visit. I note that the Council do not dispute this point, however in any event, I find the proposal to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area for the reasons identified above.
16. Consequently, I conclude that the proposals the subject of Appeal B would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policies Q5, Q7, Q8 and Q11 of the LP. These policies seek to ensure that development is visually attractive, sustains and reinforces local distinctiveness including roofscapes, responding positively to the original architecture and roof form of the building or group. It would also conflict with the SPD which seeks to avoid development which would adversely affect the appearance of the building or its contribution to the wider street scene. Furthermore, it would conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure that development achieves a high standard of design and is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

17. I conclude that the proposals in Appeal A and Appeal B conflict with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, Appeal A and Appeal B are both dismissed.

E Pickernell

INSPECTOR