



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2024

by E Catcheside BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25.04.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/23/3335064

19 Allnutt Way, Lambeth, London SW4 9RG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr P Kiss against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 23/02357/FUL.
 - The development proposed is "single storey porch, two storey side, part single part two storey rear extension. Loft conversion to include rear dormer".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have been provided with details of a Certificate of Lawful Development (Proposed) (CLPD) that was issued in relation to proposed development at the appeal site on 26 February 2024. The parties have been provided with an opportunity to comment on the implications of the CLPD for the appeal proposal. I have taken the CLPD, and the comments received in relation to it, into account in my consideration of the appeal.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised in December 2023. As the revisions do not affect the main issue in this case, the parties have not been invited to make further comments.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace dwelling in an area that predominantly comprises terraced properties and apartment blocks. The host dwelling shares many of the characteristic features of other end-of terrace-properties in the area, including its gable end fronting the street. The form and layout of the terraced rows creates a strong sense of symmetry and architectural rhythm, which is a distinctive feature of the area. Long views of the terraced rows are available from surrounding streets, which typically have a straight alignment.
6. The proposed development would retain the host property's front facing gable feature and the proposed porch would be relatively modest in size. However, although the side extension would be set back from the front elevation, it

would extend to the full height of the existing dwelling and, consequently, would be a bulky feature that would lack subservience and would fail to integrate sympathetically with the host property. In that regard the development would not accord with the guidance for side extensions set out in the Lambeth Design Guide Part 4 Building Alterations, Extensions and Retrofit (August 2023) document.

7. Furthermore, at full height, the side extension would be a dominant structure that would disrupt the symmetry that is a distinctive feature of the area. Consequently, it would be unduly prominent in views from the public realm and would detract from the architectural rhythm of the terraces, and the relationships between them, that can currently be observed from Allnut Way and Worsopp Drive. The proposal would therefore fail to respect the prevailing pattern of development in the area.
8. The proposed additions to the rear would not be significantly deep. However, the alterations to the roof structure, when combined with the proposed side and rear extensions, would lead to the complete loss of the existing rear gable. Moreover, the proposed dormer would be a substantial structure that would conceal most of the existing roof ridge. Consequently, the proposed development would fail to respond positively to the design and architectural features of the host property and the wider terraced row.
9. My attention has been drawn to the presence of other front porches and dormer extensions in close proximity to the appeal site, which I observed on my site visit. I do not have sufficient evidence before me to be certain about the full circumstances that led to those developments becoming established. However, from my observations, nearby porches and dormers are generally subservient structures that do not detract from the architectural integrity of the host property. In contrast, the proposed development would be significantly greater in scale and would fail to integrate sympathetically with the host dwelling. Moreover, I have taken account of other developments in the area in my consideration of the appeal scheme, as they form part of the character and appearance of the area.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, there would be conflict with Policies Q5, Q8 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 Adopted September 2021, and the Framework, insofar as they expect development to respond positively to the character of the area and to be visually attractive.

Other Matters

11. The appeal site has the benefit of the aforementioned CLPD for rear and side extensions, side dormer extension, and front porch extension at the appeal site. The CLPD shows that some development could be implemented at the host property without the need for planning permission. I have no reason to doubt that the CLPD scheme would be implemented in the event this appeal is dismissed. However, the CLPD scheme would be less harmful because it would not include two storey side and rear extensions and the dormer would not extend to full ridge height. Therefore, whilst I have had regard to the CLPD as a viable fallback position, it has not been determinative to the outcome of the appeal.

12. The appeal site lies within an archaeological priority area due to its proximity to the site of a Roman road. Therefore, if the development were to be permitted, it could disturb as yet unidentified heritage assets. There is very limited evidence before me about the potential significance of the heritage assets. However, it is reasonably likely that any harm could be mitigated through a programme of archaeological works and recording. If no harm had been identified in respect of the main issue, the potential harm to the heritage assets would need to be weighed against the benefits of the proposal. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I have not considered this further.
13. The appeal site is not a listed building and does not lie within a Conservation Area. Moreover, there is no evidence of any objection to the development from neighbouring residents. However, the absence of statutory designations or local objections does not alter my conclusions on the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

14. The proposal conflicts with the development plan. The material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

E Catchside

INSPECTOR