



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2024

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/24/3350668

29A Rosedene Avenue, Lambeth, London, SW16 2LS

- 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 Neil Broadbent against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 24/01270/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey ground floor rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single-storey ground floor rear and side extension at 29A Rosedene Avenue, Lambeth, London, SW16 2LS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01270/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: Drg Nos 1025/EX/001, 1025/EX/002, 1025/EX/003, 1025/EX/004, 1025/EX/005, 1025/EX/006, 1025/P/100, 1025/P/101, 1025/P/102, 1025/P/103, and 1025/P/105.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external walls of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling with a detached garage to the side, set within a sub-urban residential neighbourhood comprising predominantly semi-detached homes of mixed forms. The proposal is for the erection of a single-storey extension that would be set away from the side common boundary with the attached property at No 31A by 800mm and which would project to a depth of 4m at this point, and which would partly wrap around the exposed flank wall of the dwelling.

4. It is evident that many semi-detached pairs along Rosedene Avenue would originally have been symmetrical in form and appearance, including Nos 29A and 31A. Nevertheless, many have been altered beyond their origins through a variety of modifications, including side extensions, roof extensions, window replacements, materials changes, and the like. As such, much of the local development pattern's original symmetry and repetition of form has been lost, as is evident within the street scene. The appeal property is a case in point. With a hip to gable change, rear dormer window, contemporary replacement windows and painted render and brickwork, the importance of any symmetry with 31A has been lost. Whilst well-maintained and visually prominent in the street scene, due to their position immediately opposite the junction where Romeyn Road joins Rosedene Avenue, I find nothing about the semi-detached pair at Nos 29A and 31A that makes them particularly distinctive amongst their contemporaries or sensitive to further change.
5. The Council's officer's report states that although the wall height of the extension would measure 2.7m (the eaves height), the extension would appear as one and a half storeys from the rear. That would not be the case. Although the addition would be finished with a shallow pitched, hipped roof and small flat area, its maximum height would measure 3.6m, with the roof joining the dwelling well below the cill height of the rear facing first-floor windows. The additional floorspace would be large in comparison to the ground floor space of the original dwelling, but a significant proportion of this would be achieved by extending the dwelling to the side. This element would be set well away from the plot's side common boundary with No 29 and would be deeply recessed behind the dwelling's front elevation and largely screened from sight in views from Rosedene Avenue by the side garage. There is nothing about the development when viewed within the street scene that would make it appear cramped in its setting or visually incongruent.
6. At a depth of 4m beyond the dwelling's rear wall, the extension would be residential in scale and form, neither overly deep nor tall. Indeed, its depth would compare favourably with some other permitted single-storey extensions to semi-detached homes in the immediate area along Rosedene Avenue, as demonstrated by the appellant. For instance, at No 26, on the south side of the road, a 4m deep extension was given prior approval by the Council January 2022 (Ref 21/04557/PDE). Planning permission was granted in 2012 for a 3.8m deep single-storey conservatory extension at 27 Rosedene Avenue (Ref 12/02488/FUL), and prior approval was given in 2014 for a 5.5m deep single-storey extension at 45 Rosedene Avenue.
7. It is evident that similarly deep extensions within the area are not unusual. At single-storey, with a shallow pitched roof, the height would be appropriately subservient to the two-storey dwelling. Regardless of the existing additions to the property, I find nothing about the proposed extension's form that would appear bulky or overly dominant. Despite the property's uniquely deep garden when compared with neighbouring plots, the extension would not erode the reasonably spacious garden setting of the wider area to a degree that would convey any sense of overdevelopment.
8. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposal would relate satisfactorily to the character and appearance of the property and wider area. As such, I am unable to find conflict with the guidance for rear or side extensions within the *Lambeth Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document Part 4: Building*

Alterations, Extensions and Retrofit (SPD), or with Policy Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (adopted in 2021), which requires extensions to be subordinate and not unacceptably dominate the host building.

Other Matters

9. I have carefully considered the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions at 31A Rosedene Avenue. The application was made and determined on the basis of an extension to the property as a single-family dwellinghouse. Use of the proposed space would function accordingly. There is no evidence to suggest any noise nuisance would occur, including from any plant or machinery, or that the proposal would cause any issues with regard to drainage or existing services.
10. The extension would be set away from the common side boundary with the attached property. At the time of my visit there were no trees or bushes of any significance that would be affected by the proposal. Due to the degree of separation, and the single-storey scale of the proposed extension, including having regard to its pitched roof form, I am satisfied that it would not impose itself in the outlook from No 31A at either ground or first-floor levels, or from the garden, as an overly intrusive or overbearing presence.
11. The SPD applies a 45-degree plan and elevation test for extensions that are perpendicular to a neighbour's window in order to determine if any further detailed review in terms of impact upon daylight is required. The SPD advises that for the test to fail this must be in reference to consideration of a fail in both plan and elevation. The proposal would pass the test in elevation. There would be no conflict with the Council's guidelines with regard to daylight.
12. I recognise that there may be some impact upon late evening sunlight to the rear facing glazed patio door and side windows, and to the garden space immediately adjoining. But I am not persuaded that the effect from this upon the neighbour's overall living and outside spaces would be significant. I note that my findings on this matter reflect those of the Council. I am mindful also of the potential to build a single-storey extension to the appeal property immediately along the boundary with No 31A up to 3m in depth as permitted development.

Conditions

13. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. The application details the use of grey tiles to the roof of the extension. This would contrast with the red roof tiles on the dwelling. However, given the subservient scale and height of the extension, I agree with the appellant's assertion that this choice would sufficiently complement the appearance of the existing dwelling. Nevertheless, in the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area, a condition is required to ensure that the walls of the extension are finished to match the appearance of the immediately facing elevations.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR