



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2024

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/24/3346759

160 Hydethorpe Road, Lambeth, London, SW12 0JD

- 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 & Mrs R Niaz & S Tumi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 24/00450/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear-side single-storey infill extension, a rear main roof dormer extension and a rear outrigger roof dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear-side single-storey infill extension, a rear main roof dormer extension and a rear outrigger roof dormer extension at 160 Hydethorpe Road, Lambeth, London, SW12 0JD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00450/FUL, 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 approved plans: Site Location Plan at scale 1:1250 and Drg Nos 160-Hydthp.Rd/Extg.10, 160-Hydthp.Rd/Extg.11, 160-Hydthp.Rd/Extg.12, 160-Hydthp.Rd/Extg.13, 160-Hydthp.Rd/Prop.20, 160-Hydthp.Rd/Prop.21 Rev 01, 160-Hydthp.Rd/Prop.22 Rev 01, and 160-Hydthp.Rd/Prop.23 Rev 01.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey terraced dwelling in a wider residential area comprising similar style and aged properties. In common with the local development pattern, the dwelling has a subservient, two-storey rear outrigger across part of its rear elevation. This arrangement is mirrored by neighbouring properties. There is a further single-storey flat roof element beyond the outrigger with a roof terrace above. The proposal comprises two distinct parts. At ground floor it is proposed to erect a single-storey infill extension to the side of the outrigger and to align with the depth of the single-storey element. This

would include other works to the ground floor rear elevation with the insertion across its new full width of glazed doors. At roof level it is proposed to add a full width rear facing flat roofed dormer. This would attach to a similar dormer over the outrigger creating an L-shaped rear roof addition. The associated loft conversion would include two roof lights inserted into the property's front elevation.

4. The Council has no objection to the ground floor extension. I have no reason to disagree. It would adjoin a similar sized infill extension to the neighbouring property at No 162 and would sit comfortable in its setting. Similarly, I have no reason to disagree with their view that the front roof lights would be acceptable, which I saw are commonplace locally.
5. During my visit I observed that flat roofed rear L-shaped roof extensions were commonplace, including at both neighbouring properties and further afield along Hydethorpe Road as well as to the rear of properties backing onto the appeal site at Cambray Road. The Council argues that these are the result of works carried out as permitted development. Whilst that may be true for many, it is not exclusively so, as evidenced by the appellants.
6. In April 2024, planning permission Ref 24/00480/FUL was granted for works at 118 Hydethorpe Road. This included the erection of a roof extension to the rear outrigger. I have been presented with a copy of the plans and officer's report. The permission granted resulted in a L-shaped roof extension with the dormer over the rear outrigger set 1m back from its rear facing elevation. In that instance the Council recognised that L-shaped dormer rear roof extensions could be found on a number of premises along the terrace and surrounding area. They went on to conclude that the principle of such development was in place and that the proposal would not impact upon the character or appearance of the surrounding area.
7. It is clear that such rear roof extensions are an established feature of the area. I observed for myself that these vary significantly in terms of scale and appearance. The proposal at No 160 would be recessed behind the rear wall of the outrigger by 1m. In terms of scale and bulk, there is little to discern it from the works that were recently approved at No 118.
8. The proposal is to finish the dormer with zinc cladding. It would not match the existing roof which is clad with concrete roof tiles. However, this would become entirely obscured by the roof extension, as is the case with all the other local examples. Furthermore, zinc cladding has been used on at least one other example locally. Obliquely to the rear of No 160, a L-shaped zinc clad rear roof extension can be clearly seen on 82 Cambray Road. Its dark coloured exterior finish is no more conspicuous than any other similar but alternatively clad roof extension.
9. The Council is further concerned that alterations proposed to first-floor windows and the windows on the proposed roof extension would not respect the size or style of the existing fenestration on the host building. The Council has no objection to the fenestration pattern proposed for the ground floor extension. I have no reason to disagree with their conclusion even though it would be a significant departure from the property's original openings. The first-floor patio door opening from the end gable of the outrigger to the roof terrace would be unchanged but would broadly match the style of the new ground floor glazing with vertical proportions and horizontal glazing bars. The

glazing to the rear facing first-floor window to the main part of the dwelling would be changed to match the others at the lower levels. The size of the window aperture would be unchanged, which was an amendment undertaken by the appellants during the determination period for the planning application. The windows to the dormer extension would similarly match the others. Many properties in the area have a range of replacement window styles. The appeal property would be no different but would display an appropriately cohesive approach for the dwelling as a whole.

10. In light of how the area has evolved, I am satisfied that the proposed roof addition would appear neither incongruous nor over dominant in its setting. It would merely reflect the character of dwellings locally. Although it may not exactly follow the advice for new dormers as contained within the *Lambeth Design Guide Part 4: Building Alterations, Extensions and Retrofit* Supplementary Planning Document, I find no conflict with Policies Q5 or Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020–2035, adopted in 2021, as far as they seek to ensure that new development responds positively to and respects the area’s local distinctiveness, and the architectural integrity of the building or its group.

Conditions

11. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. I have dealt with the materials proposed for the roof extension above. The single-storey rear extension would be almost entirely enclosed by existing build. Its exposed rear elevation would be principally glass. Also given its rear garden setting, I see no reason to impose a condition that would require any materials to match the existing building.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the property or that of the wider area. In the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR