



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: 8 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/23/3330202

61 Top Floor Flat, Brayburne Avenue, Lambeth, London SW4 6AB

- 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 Romy Attias against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 23/01671/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable rear roof mansard extension with the addition of two roof lights to the front slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the decision notice describes the proposal as the erection of a hip to gable rear roof mansard extension with the addition of two roof lights to the front and a Juliet balcony to the rear. I consider that this more accurately describes the proposal and have taken it into account in my determination of the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The host property is an upper floor flat of a three-storey end terrace in a predominantly residential area. There are a mix of house styles and designs in the area.
5. The proposal includes the erection of a hip to gable rear roof mansard extension with the addition of two roof lights to the front elevation and a Juliet balcony to the rear. As the property is an end terrace the proposed gable would be visible from Brayburne Road. However, due to the position on the short terrace the hip to gable extension would not cause a disruption to the roof scape in the area.
6. There is an existing rooflight on the front elevation of the host property and an additional one on the hip of the roof. The proposed rooflights on the front elevation would be larger and would appear as a disproportionate addition to the roof of the building. In addition, they would not reflect the fenestration details of the floors below as they would have a horizontal rather than a

vertical emphasis of the existing windows. This would result in a dominant feature and harm the character of the building.

7. Whilst the guidance in the Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2015) (SPD) may not specifically mention Juliet Balconies, it does state that dormers should be subordinate, be of an appropriate size and alignment, and should incorporate window types and styles in keeping with, or which would improve, the host building. The Juliet balcony and bi-fold doors would appear dominant and along with the other smaller proposed dormer there would be glazing to a large proportion of the rear elevation of the mansard roof. This would unbalance the appearance of the rear roofscape.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of roofscape features and developments in the area. Whilst they show examples of mansard roofs, they do not include Juliet balconies and bi-fold doors. In any event I have determined the appeal on the site-specific circumstances of the case.
9. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies Q5, Q8 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (LLP) which together amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development positively responds to the original architecture, detailing and fenestration of the host building and that rooflights are modest and respect the character of it. It would also conflict with guidance in the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework which have similar aims.

Conclusion

10. 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