



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2023

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/23/3318174
6 Sibella Road, Lambeth, London SW4 6HX

- 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 Messrs Julian & Eifion Wyatt & Morris against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 22/03651/FUL, dated 12 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (i) the character and appearance of the appeal building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Sibella Road Conservation Area, and (ii) the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 4 Sibella Road with regards to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is situated in an area characterised by Victorian terraced and semi-detached properties that are set back a short distance from the highway behind front garden areas. This consistency, as well as in the predominant use of yellow stock brick and regular features such as bay windows, combine together to contribute positively to the leafy, traditional character of the Conservation Area.
4. The proposed extension would use sympathetic materials and only project marginally deeper than the existing addition to the rear, leaving the majority of the garden intact. It would be single storey and comparable to the height of the existing shallow bay. However, the extension would span the entire width of the site and would not stop short of the corners of the existing property. In this regard, my attention has been drawn to the Building Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which states that extensions should stop short of existing corners to better emphasise their subordination, even if only by a single brick. The proposal, whilst to the rear, fails to do this and would not achieve an adequate subordination to the existing building.

5. I note the Council's concern on the loss of the existing shallow bay, and the prevalence of this feature in the area. Many of the nearby properties however have been subject to alterations that have altered the original form of the bays, as I was able to see on the appeal property and the neighbour at No. 4. As such, I do not consider the loss of this architectural feature would be harmful. This would not however outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the proposal not being a subordinate addition.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the appeal building and it would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such, it would be contrary to Policies Q5, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (Local Plan), which seek, amongst other matters, for development to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas, and for extensions to be subordinate, particularly in relation to heritage assets. It would also be contrary to the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), which seek to conserve the special interest of heritage assets.
7. Where less than substantial harm would arise, such as in this case, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. I have not been made aware of any such benefits in this instance.

Living Conditions

8. The proposal would extend past the existing ground floor building line of the neighbouring property at No. 4. However, I do not consider the additional projection of 2.6m or the increase in height along the boundary between these two properties to be significant. The neighbouring occupants at No. 4 would continue to enjoy an open outlook to the rear from their large rear glazed openings and the development would not create an undue sense of enclosure.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 4 Sibella Road with regards to outlook. As such, the proposal would not be contrary to Policy Q2 of the Local Plan or Paragraph 130 of the Framework, which seek, amongst other matters, for development to provide adequate outlook.

Other Matters

10. The appellant consulted the neighbouring occupier at No. 4 and the application subject of this appeal did not receive any objections. These are however neutral matters, and not ones which weigh in favour of the development.

Conclusion

11. There would be no harm arising in relation to the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, but I find the development would be unacceptable in relation to the character and appearance of the appeal building and that it would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
12. I have found that the proposal would conflict with the development plan read as a whole. It has not been demonstrated that there are any material

considerations of sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR