
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2023

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7TH August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/22/3312088

10 Carson Road, Lambeth, London, SE21 8HU.

- 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 Holly Bott against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 22/03317/FUL, dated 15 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as single storey rear extension and new roof including a front and rear dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property and whether it would serve to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 10 Carson Road, is a semi-detached Victorian two-storey dwelling with loft conversion, rear extension and relatively large rear garden. It is located in the Rosendale Road Conservation Area.
4. The appellant proposes a single storey, flat roofed, 'L' shaped rear extension that would wrap around the existing two-storey outshot, encompassing the existing single store rear projection, along with the replacement roof together with new front and rear dormer windows.

Single storey rear extension

5. The rear extension would enclose the original rear outshot but would not extend further towards the side boundary to number 8 than the original flank wall of the dwelling.
6. As designed the walls of the extension would not be set in from the flank wall of the main house. Accordingly, therefore, and notwithstanding its flat roof form, due to the overall footprint, wrap around design and its relationship to the existing out shot and the main dwelling it would visually subsume the existing rear outshot at ground floor level. Accordingly, in the context of the

design of the original dwelling it would, on balance, appear as an uncharacteristic and dominant addition.

7. Furthermore, while having regard to the design of the host property, I consider given the vernacular style of the proposed addition along with choice of face brickwork, the proportions and disposition of the openings in the rear wall of the proposed extension to be aberrant and jarring.
8. The appellant has submitted a modified proposal indicating a 'brick-width' step in at the junction of the host building and the proposed addition. However, I do not consider that, in this case, this amendment to the design proposal would alone be sufficient to overcome my concerns set out above.
9. Due to the size, form of construction of the proposed addition and its relationship to the existing outshot I consider that it would appear as uncharacteristic and over dominant addition that would detract from the prominence of the rear outshot which is a particular characteristic of this and neighbouring dwellings. The proposal would thereby also fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Dormers

10. Policy Q11 section I Lambeth Local Plan 2020 – 2035 (Adopted September 2021) (LP) deals with the design of dormers windows. Along with other things, it seeks to avoid dormers in front roof slope (unless similar buildings in the immediate context already exhibit appropriate front dormers), dormers are required to be of design, materials and detailing appropriate to the host building, and on sensitive buildings (including heritage assets), where dormers are considered appropriate in principle, they should also be modest in size, aligned with the openings below.

Front dormer

11. There is an eclectic mix of dormers to the front roof slope of this and the neighbouring dwellings. The existing front dormer to the host property is a typical, narrow single window, vernacular style dormer with a pitched roof. The dormer to the front roof slope of the neighbouring attached property is a somewhat fussy three light dormer with semi-circular raised roof over the central light. The appellant proposes replacing the existing dormer with a flat roofed three light dormer similar in width but not design to that at number 12.
12. To my mind the introduction of yet another dormer here of a contrasting form, design and style would cause harm to both the architectural integrity of host property, the semi-detached pair, the visual amenity of the street scene and thereby the character and appearance of the conservation area.
13. I appreciate in terms of the width of the dormer it would serve to rebalance the symmetry of the semi-detached pair. However, I do not believe that this consideration would outweigh the harm the introduction of yet another large and uncharacteristic dormer in the context of the host property here would cause.

Rear dormer

14. As I saw the other half of the semi-detached pair of houses has a wide and somewhat bulky flat roof dormer in its rear roof slope. In principle therefore I

see no reason why a dormer would not be appropriate in the rear roof slope here.

15. However, that proposed would be in direct contrast to the existing narrow pitched roof dormer to the front roof slope, being a flat roofed two light dormer. It would not be as wide as that to number 12. Nevertheless, it would appear wide in comparison to the existing front dormer. Further, from the design drawings it would be of a bulky design out of keeping with the general style and detailing of the host property.
16. Given the fenestration pattern of the existing rear elevation I do not believe that alignment with existing windows is important here. I also agree with the appellant that the rear dormer, due to its size and location would, in the context of its relationship to the rear roof slope be subordinate to it. Nevertheless, the proposed dormer should be of a design and built from materials and detailing appropriate to the host building. Accordingly, due to its design, scale and detailing the proposed rear dormer would add to the harm to the integrity of the host building and thereby the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Alternations to existing fenestration

17. It is proposed to alter the proportions of the existing sash window at first floor level overlooking the rear garden. It would be slightly higher and fixed glazed and not a sliding sash to reflect the design detailing of the existing window.
18. The proposed window would cause harm to the established fenestration pattern of the house, which has remained largely intact. I therefore consider that this alteration would be harmful to the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Conclusion

19. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, which include conservation areas. It draws a distinction between substantial harm and less than substantial harm to such an asset. For the latter, which applies here, the test is that the harm should be weighed against public benefits, including securing the optimum viable use.
20. The development would provide additional habitable accommodation and provide some limited economic benefit. However, given the harm that has been identified I conclude that the public benefits would not outweigh this harm, or the conflict that the development would have with the objectives of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Framework and LP Policies Q5, Q11 and Q22 and the relevant guidance contained in the Lambeth *Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)* (Adopted September 2015) as they relate to the quality of development and the preservation or enhancement of the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Other Matters

21. I note the Council found that the proposal would not have any adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers. However, the

absence of harm is a neutral factor in my considerations and, as such, I have given this matter very little weight in my decision.

22. The appellant has suggested that the proposed extension should be considered in the context of the provision of permitted development rights that may be enjoyed by the property. Whether or not the development proposal falls to be considered as permitted development is not a matter for me to determine in this instance and it is for the appellant to resolve this matter independently of this appeal. I have therefore given this consideration limited weight in my deliberations.

Overall Conclusions

23. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the lack of objection from neighbours, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR