



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2023 by S Wilson LLB MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 July 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/23/3317396

1A Spenser Road, London, SE24 0NS

- 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 David Randall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 22/04409/FUL, dated 13 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of a double storey extension towards the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Poets Corner Conservation Area (PCCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. 1A Spenser Road is a detached Victorian property with a distinct and pleasant traditional feel. It has a dual pitched roof and red brick frontage with a double height bay. The roof gable end has elaborate bargeboards and a finial, whilst the flanks and rear are constructed with yellow stock brick. There is a lower height, subordinate two-storey rear outrigger.
5. The significance of the PCCA derives, according to the PCCA Appraisal, primarily from its use of "pattern books" resulting in an eclectic variety of house styles combined with the application of a wide range of decorations and various types of brick. It is set out that diversity makes the area so attractive while it maintains an overall feel of unity due to the comfortable domestic scale and the repetition of elements used in different ways. The appeal building is specifically identified and has many of the attributes described which, taken together, means it makes a positive contribution to the historic and architectural character and appearance of the PCCA.

6. The appeal proposal would extend the existing rear outrigger at both ground and first floor with a steel, glass and cladded design. The design would be stepped back from the main house at first storey level. A flat glass roof would form the roof top, meeting the outrigger just below the ridgeline and a composite clad sloping roof would have two rooflights.
7. The step back at first storey level between the proposal and the main house and the use of glass for the roof and the front and rear elevations of the extension would be unsuccessful in attempting to allow the original house's rear elevation to be read. Whilst it would allow some visibility to the original rear structure, the composite cladding would form a significant part of the extension and would partially obscure it. In addition, the roof shape of the extension would fail to follow the traditional architectural feature of the dual pitch roof of both the main house and the outrigger, resulting in a dominance of the traditional proportions of the rear elevation.
8. Views of the first floor and roof of the extension from Spenser Road would be available between the adjacent property and the appeal site. I visited the site in mid-summer, and it was easy to view the existing rear outrigger. Therefore, I am not convinced that the existing foliage would be an adequate screen of the proposed development. With this and the above in mind, the proposal would not be a contextual response to positive aspects of the appeal property, the local context or the historic character of the area. It would thus fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the PCCA.
9. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. Given the scale and location of the proposed development, the harm to the significance of the PCCA would be less than substantial in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework). Nevertheless, it is a matter of considerable importance and weight. I am required to balance this harm against the public benefits of the proposal.
10. The appeal property appears to already be a viable and substantial residential dwellinghouse. There is no compelling evidence that the proposed extension is required to enable this to continue. In addition, the property benefits from the grant of permission for a single storey rear infill extension and a side dormer roof extension under application ref: 22/03102/FUL. I would therefore afford this matter limited weight.
11. The scale and massing of this proposal has been reduced from a previously refused scheme. It would retain garden space and would be similar in height to other outriggers in the vicinity. Acceptable standards of privacy and outlook would be provided, and the scheme would not have an unacceptable impact on levels of daylight and sunlight for the occupiers of the host building or adjoining property including their gardens or outdoor spaces. Be these as they may, they would represent a lack of harm in each case which, by definition, cannot be used to weigh against it.
12. The public benefits would not therefore outweigh the less than substantial harm, identified above, to the character or appearance of the PCCA. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to comply with Policies Q2, Q5, Q8, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2021), insofar as they require development to be of high-quality design that preserves the character and

appearance of the host property and preserve the character or appearance of the PCCA. Similarly, the proposal would be contrary to the Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2015) and the heritage policies of the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight, including the approach of the Framework, that would indicate otherwise. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR