



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: 9 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/23/3318655

13 Pyrmont Grove, London SE27 0BG

- 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 Robb against the decision of The Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 22/04592/FUL, dated 5 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of L-shaped rear dormer and the installation of 2 rooflights to the front roofslope, to include the raising of the ridge of the main house by 300mm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for development described as 'erection of L-shaped rear dormer and the installation of 2 rooflights to the front roofslope, to include the raising of the ridge of the main house by 300mm' in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/04592/FUL, dated 5 January 2023 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 22234/21; 22234/22; 22234/23; 22234/15; 22234/20.
 - 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 dwelling.

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 Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, double height bay fronted, mid terrace residential dwelling with a front gable feature. It is part of terrace that has a mix of two Victorian era styles, each with a uniformity of pattern and rhythm

within their own grouping. The appeal property benefits from a Lawful Development Certificate Proposed (LDCP) Ref 22/03254/LDCP, for an L-shaped rear dormer together with the installation of 2 rooflights to the front roofslope. The proposed development would be similar to the granted LDCP with the point of contention being the proposal to raise the roofline by 300mm.

5. Whilst the front of the wider terrace is pleasantly symmetrical and rhythmic, slight variations in the roof line are visible. This is noticeable between numbers 12-13 and 14-15, with the former appearing to be as a result of development and the latter appearing to be as constructed. The surrounding area has steep gradients and steps in the surrounding terraces.
6. The rear elevations also demonstrate a rhythmic pattern with many original outriggers retaining a pleasant symmetry. However, there are a number of roof extensions directly adjacent to the appeal property that both increase their ridgeline and benefit from substantial rear dormer extensions.
7. Raising the ridgeline at number 13 would raise it to the same height as number 12, continuing that ridgeline. Consequently, the ridgeline would step down at number 14, before stepping again at number 15. Due to the front gables, the front roofslope and the existing variations in the ridgeline, the proposed raising of the roofline would be barely perceptible. Even if it were perceived, it would not be an incongruous, bulky feature at this terrace at this location, and it would not dominate the host dwelling. Therefore, the architectural integrity of both the terrace and the appeal property would be maintained and the distinctiveness of the area would be sustained.
8. With the above in mind, the proposed development would not detrimentally affect the character or appearance of the appeal property or the wider area. Accordingly, it would comply with Policies Q5, Q7, Q8, and Q11 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. Similarly, the proposal would comply with the Building Alterations and Extensions SPD (2015) insofar as it seeks to protect the design integrity of the host building.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, a condition is necessary to require the development to accord with the approved plans, to provide certainty and precision. Furthermore, a condition requiring materials used in the extension to match the existing building is necessary in the interest of preserving the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR