



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2023

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/23/3321136

78 Jasper Road, Lambeth, London SE19 1SQ

- 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 & Mrs Needham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 23/00203/FUL, dated 22 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear dormer loft extension, plus hip to gable loft extension; with new rooflights to front elevation of existing roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear dormer loft extension, plus hip to gable loft extension; with new rooflights to front elevation of existing roof at 78 Jasper Road, Lambeth, London SE19 1SQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00203/FUL, dated 22 January 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan and Drg Nos 2102 JPH ZZ ZZ DR A 010 Rev P02, 2102 JPH ZZ ZZ DR A 011 Rev P02, 2102 JPH ZZ ZZ DR A 020 Rev P02 and 2102 JPH ZZ ZZ DR A 021 Rev P02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modest, two-storey, end of terraced dwelling with a shallow hipped roof over and set within a small cul-de-sac development with two opposing and similar short terraces set perpendicular to the main part of Jasper Road. No 78 is set furthest from the entrance to the cul-de-sac from Jasper Road. Due to the topography of the land, the ridge and eaves lines to Nos 74, 76 and 78 within the terrace are stepped noticeably lower than those

- at Nos 70 and 72. The proposal would change the side hipped roof to a gable and include a 'box-like' dormer to the rear elevation.
4. Part 4 of the Council's *Building Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD), September 2015, deals with roof alterations and extensions. It advises that, in general, hip to gable extensions should not harm the design integrity of the host building or its group, or lead to a loss of spatial character. In this instance the terrace is asymmetrical, with a gable end to the opposing side of No 70. Furthermore, No 78 is well separated from the rear elevations of the nearest buildings to the side, along Woodland Road. This change to the roof profile of the terrace would complement the existing building without any harm to the spatial character of the area.
 5. In relation to dormer windows, the SPD advice translates into a requirement that they should be subordinate to the host building by being set in from the sides, up from the eaves and down from the ridge. This is directly reflected by the specific requirements of part I ii of Policy Q11 *Building alterations and extensions* of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020–2035 (LLP). In this instance the proposed dormer would fail to show any degree of subordination. Despite the use of vertical hung tiles to match the existing roof, the dormer would dominate the rear roof of the building, significantly altering its profile and form. As a consequence, due to its size and dominance, the rear dormer addition would conflict with both the SPD guidance and Policy Q11. For the same reasons it would also conflict with part B ii of LLP Policy Q5 *Local distinctiveness*.
 6. At the time of my visit, I saw that the immediately attached property at No 76 was being extended with a roof alteration to include a rear, 'box-like' dormer window and front rooflights. Works were well advanced. I have been presented with evidence from the appellants to demonstrate that these works are progressing as permitted development following the grant of a Certificate of Lawfulness (Ref 22/01044/LDCP) issued in May 2022.
 7. I accept that the development at No 76 has not been tested against the relevant policies of the development plan. Nevertheless, the roof alterations will become a significant part of the roof profile that will not only dominate No 76 itself, but the terrace as a whole, especially the subordinate group at Nos 74–78 (even). Moreover, the evidence provided shows that the form and appearance of the dormer under construction at No 76 will be identical in scale, materials and detail to that proposed at No 78.
 8. The proposal at No 78 would combine with that at No 76 to create the perception of one large and wide rear dormer that would effectively span both properties. But at the same time, it would serve to restore a degree of balance to the rear roof profile, albeit in a significantly altered but, nevertheless, unified form. The circumstances at No 76, and the resulting combined form of the works being undertaken there together with the appeal proposal, are material considerations in this instance, and to which I attach significant weight.
 9. In addition, the rear roof slope of No 78 is largely tucked out of sight from the public domain. It can unquestionably be seen from the rear outlook of upper floors to the three-storey buildings to the south in Westow Hill. However, these are set on much higher ground and are commercially occupied at ground floor levels with no obvious amenity value to the rear at this level. Based on my observations, the outlook from upper levels would most likely over-sail the

roof of No 78, but in any case, I have found that there would be some visual merit to the proposed dormer based upon its associations with No 76. This would apply equally to limited views of it that would be had from the rear of some three-storey dwellings that back on to the cul-de-sac along Woodland Road, to the west, and a limited oblique view that would be had from the main part of Jasper Road itself to the east.

10. Turning to the proposed roof lights to the front elevation. These would be large. However, they would mirror that which is being constructed at No 76 as permitted development in terms of size, placement and alignment. In a similar vein to the rear dormer, they would also restore some balance to the front roof slope of the terrace as a whole. As such, I find that they would sufficiently respect the character of the host building, in conformity with part J of LLP Policy Q11 and the requirements of Policy Q5 in terms of respect for local distinctiveness.
11. Overall, I find that despite the size and scale of the proposed dormer window, the specific circumstances in this case lead me to conclude that the development overall would not harm the character or appearance of the host building or wider area. Therefore, although I have identified some conflict with LLP Policies Q5 and Q11 as far as they specifically relate to the dormer window, other material considerations lead me to conclude in this instance that the appeal should succeed.

Conditions

12. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area, a condition is required to ensure that the proposal is finished with materials to match the existing.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR