



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 May 2024

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/24/3337738

2C Lambourn Road, Lambeth, London SW4 0LY

- 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 Ms E Blumsom against the decision of London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 23/02936/FUL dated 30 March 2023 and refused on the 6 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is Erection of a second storey mansard extension and new windows to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site is located within the Wandsworth Road Conservation Area (CA). I am therefore mindful of my statutory duties in respect of Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (the Act).

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - Whether or not the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wandsworth Road Conservation Area; and
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the adjacent occupants with particular regard to outlook and sense of enclosure.

Reasons

Effect on the significance of the conservation area

4. The Wandsworth Road (CA) as a designated heritage asset is linear and characterised by 19th and 20th Century buildings in three separate areas along Wandsworth Road, built at that time to serve the demand for a growing population of workers and artisans. Terraces of houses of largely two and three stories line the southern side of Wandsworth Road dating from the 1850's and 60's and built of London stock brick with restrained Italianate influences, stucco detailing and decoration. Despite the variations to its built character, seen across the conservation area, the area retains significant historic and architectural interest.

5. The appeal site is the return rear outrigger of residential Number 763 Wandsworth Road, Lambourn House, and is now a separate dwelling with its own independent access from Lambourn Road. It has been enlarged in recent times to the ground floor and has its own yard area and is encapsulated within an urban environment. From the front elevation the dwelling is rendered with a parapet but is considerably lower in height and subservient to the larger three storey end dwelling of No. 763 Wandsworth Road that it was originally closely associated with as part and parcel of this dwelling. The proposal entails a mansard roof the full width and depth of the outrigger in order to provide extra living accommodation with the main aspect to the front elevation.
6. The appeal site is located on the very edge of the CA boundary. Even though it was previously part of No. 763 Wandsworth Road and fronts onto Lambourn Road, as an outrigger it represents a more restrained design to the main dwelling with its subordinate characteristics. From my assessment, it is undeniably recognisable as the original rear return elevation of No. 763 Wandsworth Road and its inclusion within the boundary of the CA reinforces this.
7. The adjacent properties along Lambourn Road, most specifically on this side of Lambourn Road, follow the slope up the road as it climbs towards the junction with Hannington Road where the character of the street scene changes to one more akin to 20th Century housing. In views from Hannington Road looking towards Wandsworth Road and vice versa, I could see the distinctive step in the building heights up and down the slope, the majority with a parapet roof. Overall, it provides a pleasing harmonious continuity to this part of the street scene and complements the character and appearance of the CA.
8. The appeal site sits forward of the very consistent building line along this side of Lambourn Road. However, even at this, its lower-level height to the adjacent dwelling of No. 2 Lambourn Road, underpins the continuity of building heights here. The height to the mansard roof would be 'broadly consistent in height to No. 2a/b Lambourn Road' as it has been designed to correspond with this height. The information before me demonstrates that the characteristic step in building heights would be lost as a consequence of the proposal. Views into and out of the conservation area enjoy an appreciation of this stepped building line to which the appeal site forms part of the character. A mansard roof as proposed would negatively impact upon this architectural characteristic.
9. Its proportions and height would appear as a bulky and incongruous addition within this location, made more noticeable as the dwelling sits forward of the established building line. The eye would be drawn to an alien and poorly related mansard roof within a street scene where parapets conceal the traditional shallow rooves behind. Furthermore, despite support to the scheme for this type of proposal, the original and intentionally planned authentic subservience that this outrigger to No. 763 Wandsworth Road embodies, would detrimentally change. It would thus begin to appear as an unrelated and separate entity away from the one identity that it is as a rear return to No. 763, therefore detrimental to the character of the host dwelling and to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.
10. The appellant points to mansard roofs and various styles of roofs seen within the street scene as well as within other local locations. Despite the evidence of a mansard roof within close range to the appeal site, it is not positioned within

a rear return related to its original dwelling. Therefore, it does not share the same characteristics as the appeal before me. Neither do the other examples that have been brought to my attention by the appellant compare to the circumstances of the proposal before me. I therefore apply limited weight to these.

11. There are no objections raised to the new windows proposed to the existing dwelling facing the front and I have no reason to contradict these findings. However, there is nothing before me to suggest that this is solely dependent upon the proposal before me.
12. Drawing the above together I find that the proposal would harm the historic interest of the heritage asset as a whole as it would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area and as such be contrary to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Public benefits and heritage Balance

13. Paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that any harm to the significance of the heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Also, with reference to the Framework and proposals affecting heritage assets, in finding harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Given that the impact of the proposal I find that the harm to be 'less than substantial' in this instance. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The benefit of additional private space I apportion as a private benefit to the appellant. Overall, there is no public benefit of the scheme before me to amount to a clear and convincing justification to outweigh the harm I have identified. The historic environment would therefore not be safeguarded.
14. Considerable importance and weight has to be attached to harm to designated heritage assets. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. As such the proposal would be contrary to the local distinctiveness, design and heritage protection objectives of policies Q5, Q8, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (2021), the broad principles of the Lambeth Design Guide SPD (2023) and the historic environment safeguarding aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

Living Conditions

15. The garden of No. 765 and gardens beyond run parallel to the appeal site. In particular, the Council is concerned about their living conditions adversely suffering from a sense of enclosure to the rear external spaces of both 765 and 767 Wandsworth Road. A mansard roof would be a new feature and would create a higher level to the dwelling than currently exists. The mansard has been designed to slope to its sides although it would be visible from these rear neighbouring gardens. However, it would be experienced at some distance away and these gardens, despite the fact there are surrounding buildings and structures, given their relationship in this context, I consider to have a sense of openness. These factors lead me to conclude that I am not convinced that the neighbouring occupants using these external spaces would be adversely affected by a sense of enclosure as a result of the proposal.

16. There are bedroom windows of No. 763 Wandsworth Road at first and second floors that overlook the rear yard of the appeal site, which is converted into a number of flats, as too has Number 765 been converted, with windows located within the rear elevation. The first and second floor windows of No. 765 sit behind the side wall of No 763 as this building was intentionally built to be of a larger scale and mass. The outlook for occupants from these windows are therefore affected by this wall. Although they may view the proposed mansard, it would be some distance away and together with the angle to which they would experience it from these windows, would in my view not detrimentally lead to an adverse effect on their outlook and living conditions.
17. With regards to the occupants of No. 763, the first floor window sits perpendicular to the appeal site and the outlook from this window for the occupants is therefore affected by the relationship. The addition of a mansard roof above would not detrimentally affect the occupant's outlook from this window to a considerably greater level than what is currently experienced. The outlook for the occupants from the second floor window is currently unrestricted. Should the roof be erected, the occupants would view the slope of the proposed roof although this would slope away from the window. However, even with this proposed roof in place, their outlook would be otherwise open to other sides. I am not of the view that the occupants of this flat would be so adversely compromised to negatively reduce their living conditions to an unacceptable level.
18. To conclude on this main issue, the living conditions of the occupants of these dwellings would be safeguarded as a result of the proposal and therefore it would meet the broad amenity expectations of Policy Q2 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (2021).

Other Matters

19. I am aware of objections raised from local residents relating to the proposal causing amongst other things overshadowing, loss of privacy, loss of views and sunlight into their dwellings. However, as I am dismissing the appeal, there is no requirement to comment on these matters further.

Overall balance and conclusion

20. Although I have found there to be no conflict with the proposal and its effect upon the living conditions of the neighbouring occupants, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area and to that end would not protect the historic environment. This weighs considerably against the proposal in the overall balance. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR

