



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2025

by N Bromley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/24/3350380

17 Brockwell Park Row, Lambeth, London SW2 2YJ

- 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 Dominic Roarty against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 24/01303/FUL.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension replacing an existing conservatory, with some internal reconfigurations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension replacing an existing conservatory, with some internal reconfigurations, at 17 Brockwell Park Row, Lambeth, London, SW2 2YJ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01303/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, numbered: 2306-NT-x-PL-000 revision C; 2306-NT-x-PL-100 revision D; 2306-NT-x-PL-101 revision C; 2306-NT-x-PL-102 revision C; 2306-NT-x-PL-103 revision C; 2306-NT-x-PL-200 revision C; 2306-NT-x-PL-300 revision C; 2306-NT-x-PL-301 revision C; 2306-NT-x-PL-302 revision C and 2306-NT-x-PL-303 revision C.
 - 3) No development above ground level shall take place until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 12 December 2024. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a three-storey, mid-terrace dwelling within a built-up residential area. The rear of the property has a small conservatory and a modest garden, as do many neighbouring properties. The conservatory adjoins and is paired with the conservatory of 16 Brockwell Park Row (No 16).
5. The residential estate comprises blocks of uniform terrace properties. The rear walls and gardens of adjacent terrace blocks face one another, with minimal separation distances between them, creating a dense pattern of development.
6. Rear conservatories are an original feature of the existing dwellings, and many retain their original appearance, which also contributes to the uniform character of the original buildings. However, a number of the conservatories have been modified or replaced with single storey rear extensions. In particular there are two such extensions to neighbouring properties visible from the appeal site. The extensions are larger than the original and have a different style and appearance. As such, even though many of the original conservatories remain, there has been some loss of uniformity at the rear of the properties.
7. The proposed extension would have a larger footprint compared to the existing conservatory, but it would still have a modest size and appearance. The lightweight, simple design, with its timber frame, composite panels and glazed appearance, as well as the metal roof, would ensure that it would be a good quality and subservient addition to the host property.
8. In addition, and for the same reasons as set out above, although it would interrupt the uniform appearance of the block of dwellings within the same row, the proposal would not be a stark contrast compared to the design and scale of the existing conservatories. Likewise, it would not be harmful in the context of the previous extensions of neighbouring properties opposite.
9. The proposal would also not be readily visible from nearby roads due to the position at the rear of the property with screening from boundary walls and fences, as well as vegetation within the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. As a result, the proposal would not be highly prominent, and it would not be harmful to the overall prevailing architectural character and appearance of the existing properties in the locality.
10. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development is acceptable and would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Consequently, the proposal would not conflict with Policy Q5 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035, which seeks to sustain local distinctiveness and requires proposals to have a positive contextual response to the locality.

Conditions

11. I have had regard to conditions suggested by the Council, as well as to the Framework and national Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. In the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the host property

and surrounding area, a condition is imposed to require samples of the external materials to be approved.

12. I have not imposed a condition preventing the use of 'Non-Road Mobile Machinery' during the course of demolition, site preparation and construction phases, because I am not persuaded on the evidence before me that it is reasonable or necessary for a small replacement extension.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

N Bromley

INSPECTOR