



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2024

by Phillip J G Ware BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/24/3345660

The Duchy Arms, Sancroft Street, SE11 5UG

- 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 D Lonsdale against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 24/01016/FUL, dated 27 March 2024, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2024.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a mansard roof extension, together with dormer windows to provide additional habitable rooms to the existing residential unit. (First floor flat)
-

Procedural matter

1. The description of the proposal quoted above is taken from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form, rather than from the application form. However I consider that it more accurately describes the proposal.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

3. There is one main issue in this case. That is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Kennington Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal premises are a two-storey building, probably of mid-nineteenth century origin, at the corner of Sancroft Street and Courtenay Street. There is a flat roofed extension to the rear of the property. It is a symmetrical stock and red brick building with stucco window surrounds. Of particular note is the high parapet wall which screens the existing roof form.
5. The building is in use as a public house at ground floor level with residential use above.
6. Sancroft Street is a fairly wide thoroughfare running from Kennington Road to Vauxhall Street. It is part of a residential estate which appears to date from the late 18th century with a subsequent estate redevelopment in the early 20th century. The few post-war properties are generally sympathetic in scale and design, and the older buildings are of a pleasant and spacious character with well-detailed neo-Georgian features. The area, aside from major roads at the edges of the area, has a sense of quiet orderliness and modest elegance. Of

particular importance to this appeal is the fact that the area is not characterised by later roof additions.

7. The proposal is for a mansard roof extension, to be used in association with the first floor accommodation, above the existing roof. The parapet wall would not be affected and the extension would be set behind it.
8. I appreciate that the appellant has sought to minimise the effect on the proposal on the streetscene and the Conservation Area by setting the roof extension behind the existing parapet. However, even from relatively close quarters the proposal would be visible from street level and, self-evidently, to a greater degree from the upper floors of neighbouring properties.
9. The visibility of the proposal would be increased by the fact that Sancroft Street is unusually wide for a road of this type. In addition the appeal premises, located at one junction, face towards another junction – that of Sancroft Street and Newburn Street. The geometry of this combined junction means that a relatively long view of the appeal premises can be obtained from the north.
10. Particularly given the visibility of the proposal, and the general lack of roof additions in the area, the proposal would appear as an incongruous addition to the building. It would also result in the loss of the existing roof form.
11. I appreciate that the proposal would provide additional residential accommodation. Otherwise no benefits, public or private, have been advanced to set against the harm to the Conservation Area.
12. The development plan policy approach is set out in the Lambeth Plan (2021) at policies Q5, Q11 and Q22. These policies deal with the reinforcement of local distinctiveness, the need for positive responses to original architecture and roof form, and the preservation or enhancement of conservation areas. Reference has also been made to the London Plan policies, which adopt a very similar approach.
13. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 s72(1) requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any buildings or other land in a conservation area. For the above reasons the proposal would harm both the character and the appearance of the Conservation Area and conflict with the development plan policies summarised above.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P. J. G. Ware

Inspector