



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2024

by H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/24/3339929

First Floor Flat 27 Cavendish Road, Lambeth, London SW12 0BH

- 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 William Blackwell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 23/03575/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion, rear dormer, terrace, internal alterations, floor plan redesign and all associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered from that on the planning application form. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the description given on the original application, but I have removed the reference to the appeal site address as this is not an act of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and of the area.

Reasons

4. No 27 Cavendish Road (No 27) is a terraced property containing flats. The terraced row No 27 forms a part of is traditionally designed, and the properties within it exhibit some similar and distinctive design features. On neighbouring streets, there are other traditional terraced properties which share features of a like design, some of those features being ornately detailed. Consequently, and even though many properties in the area have been the subject of alterations and extensions, the traditional detailing and the strength of uniformity on display by properties contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Amongst other matters, policies Q5, Q8 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (LP) seek to ensure that development positively responds to the original architecture of the host building and the positive aspects of local character. They also require construction detailing to be visually attractive

and, in specific regard to dormers, that such developments exhibit a design, building materials and detailing appropriate to the host building.

6. The Lambeth Design Guide Part 4 Building Alterations, Extensions and Retrofit Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides design guidance in relation to building extensions and alterations, and this includes roof lights, dormers and balconies. Whilst acknowledging that such additions are an appropriate means to increase and optimise accommodation, the SPD sets out some quite prescriptive guidance to ensure they are appropriately designed.
7. The proposed dormer and the inset roof terrace would have different dimensions. Consequently, they would be set up from the eaves and set down from the roof ridge to different extents. Their proximity to the roofs of the adjoining properties on either side of them would also differ. In conflict with guidance within the SPD, the inset roof terrace would incorporate a balustrade add-on and, furthermore, the plans show that its detailed design would be different from the balustrade which would serve the proposed dormer's french doors adjacent.
8. Also in direct contrast with the design guidance of the SPD, the proposed dormer's front face would incorporate sections of wall on either side of the french doors, and it would incorporate a pronounced fascia. Rather than having the slender design advocated by the SPD, these features would make the dormer bulky in appearance. It may be that the fascia design is derived from the incorporation of a warm roof deck, but it has not been shown to me that the proposal is the only design solution through which it could be incorporated, nor that a more appropriate alternative design could not be implemented.
9. The fenestration serving the front elevation of No 27 exhibits a great deal of balance and symmetry. One of the two roof lights proposed would not be aligned with any of the existing windows below it. There is some, but less consistency to the arrangement of the windows and doors within No 27's rear elevation. However, neither the roof lights, the dormer nor the inset roof terrace proposed on the rear roof slope of the property would be aligned with the first floor windows beneath. Therefore, rather than responding sympathetically to what consistency does exist at the back of the property, the proposal would add more discord and disharmony to the elevation as a whole.
10. For the reasons I have set out above, altogether, the proposed dormer, inset roof terrace and roof lights would result in a development which would be jarring with the positive aspects of the host property's architecture and that which is exhibited in the surrounding area. Consequently, the effects of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and of the area would be unacceptable. Therefore, the development would be contrary to policies Q5, Q8 and Q11 of the LP and the guidance of the SPD.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of roofscape features and developments in the area. However, the full details of each case have not been submitted and, as a result, it is not possible to draw accurate comparisons between those schemes and that the subject of this appeal. Moreover, in my main issue, I have set out the specific reasons why the detail of the design of

this particular proposal at the appeal site would be unacceptable. The circumstances and the effects wrought by the other developments in the area are likely to differ to some extent or other from those in this case. Consequently, the cited examples are of limited weight in my determination.

12. The proposal would improve the internal accommodation of the upstairs flat, and it would provide an outdoor space which it does not currently benefit from. I accept that some betterment to the living conditions of the occupiers of the flat, and potentially future occupiers, would be derived from this. However, I find that this benefit would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified in my main issue.
13. In accordance with Policy Q2 of the LP, the effects of the proposed development upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers would not be harmful. However, this absence of harm is neutral in the planning balance, and it does not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

14. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate a decision other than one in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

H Jones

INSPECTOR