



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2024

by H Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/23/3332149

1A Fieldhouse Road, Lambeth, London SW12 0HL

- 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 Oliver May against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 23/02525/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of a rear roof mansard extension with the addition of two velux roof lights to the front slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hyde Farm Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the Hyde Farm Conservation Area (CA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. The significance of the CA is partly derived from by a coherent design of properties, mainly Tyneside Flats, with consistent materials and repetitive architectural detailing. This gives a regular rhythm to the street scene.
4. The host property is an end terrace with similar architectural features and style to the majority of the street. The front elevation, along with that of its near neighbours appears largely unaltered and it makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The rear facing element of the proposal would introduce a mansard roof form, slightly in from the side elevation and down from the ridge. Due to its overall scale, height, width and depth, it would create a sense of bulk and massing along the rear roof slope, despite its setback from the flank elevation. It would be visible in the streetscape, notwithstanding the nearby foliage. The rear mansard would therefore appear highly discordant to the original and largely unaltered roofscape of this part of the terrace within the CA.

6. The proposal would include two roof lights on front elevation. Whilst they are relatively small they would create clutter on a relatively simple existing roof form and be out of keeping with the character of the CA.
7. Accordingly, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would erode the contribution the current roof form and dwelling makes to the character and appearance of the locality. It would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA and would result in harm to its significance as a designated heritage asset.
8. I find that the proposal would conflict with the Act and harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would not accord with Policies Q2, Q5, Q8, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2021) (LLP), which together seek to ensure that development proposals reinforce local distinctiveness and characteristics, respond to the original roof form, and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area. Additionally, the proposal would conflict with guidance in the Lambeth Design Guide 4- Building Alterations, Extensions and Retrofit (2023) and the historic environment policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
9. Given that the impact of the proposal relates to only part of the Conservation Area, the harm arising in terms of the approach in the Framework, would be less than substantial. In these circumstances the Framework advises at paragraph 208 that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
10. The proposal would allow a reconfiguration of the interior of the dwelling to provide additional living accommodation allowing the occupier to remain in the property and there would be economic benefits arising from the construction process. Given the scale of the proposal these benefits would attract moderate weight.
11. I give the harm I have identified considerable importance and weight in accordance with paragraph 205 of the Framework, which establishes that great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset. In this context I find that the public benefits of the proposal are not sufficient to outweigh the degree of harm identified.

Other Matters

12. Whilst I acknowledge that the Framework supports opportunities for airspace development to accommodate new homes and make efficient use of land, this support is caveated by the expectation that development would be consistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene, and that it is well-designed (including complying with any local design policies and standards). Further support is given to mansard roof extensions on suitable properties where their external appearance harmonises with the original building, including extensions to terraces where one or more of the terraced houses already has a mansard. Although there are existing roof extensions on the terrace, due to the position and height of the proposal it would fail to accord with these expectations when considering the prevailing character of the roofscape in the terrace and the surrounding built and historic environment.

13. The appellant refers to Policy Q6 of the LLP and considered that it should have been taken into account by the Council in determining the application. However, this policy is concerned with urban design within the public realm and refers to the most effective use of the site within larger development proposals. I do not consider therefore that it is relevant to this appeal.
14. The appellant has submitted examples of roof extensions in the vicinity of the proposal including an appeal decision for 31 Fieldhouse Road¹. This appeal was determined under the previous Development Plan and relates to a mid terrace property. It is therefore not directly comparable to this appeal. I do not have the evidence before me of the planning history of the other examples and in any event, I have determined this appeal on the site-specific circumstances of this case. The presence of roof extensions elsewhere in the locality does not provide justification for harmful development.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Senior

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/N5660/W/18/3210324