



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2017

**by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 30 October 2017**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/17/3181030**

### **121 Clapham Manor Street, London, SW4 6DR**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Sarah Langford against the decision of The Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
  - The application Ref 17/01405/FUL dated 21 March 2017 was refused by notice dated 30 May 2017.
  - The development proposed is refurbishment of existing mid-terraced house over basement, ground and first floor levels, including replacement of sash windows to front facade. Single storey rear extension at garden level to replace existing rear extension and outbuilding.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for refurbishment of existing mid-terraced house over basement, ground and first floor levels, including replacement of sash windows to front facade. Single storey rear extension at garden level to replace existing rear extension and outbuilding at 121 Clapham Manor Street, London, SW4 6DR in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 17/01405/FUL dated 21 March 2017, 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: CL 001 B, CL 100 C, CL 101 D, CL 102 C, CL 105 B, CL 200 B, CL 201 B, CL 202(C) B, CL 203 A and CL 300 B.
    - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
    - 4) Prior to their installation, details of the new door and all new windows including cross-sections, materials and finishes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details and the approved door/windows shall be retained in the building thereafter.
-

## **Main Issue**

2. I consider the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and whether it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Rectory Grove Conservation Area.

## **Reasons**

3. The appeal site is situated within the Rectory Grove Conservation Area (Conservation Area) on the eastern side of Clapham Manor Street. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with Clapham Manor Street consisting mainly of terraced properties that are positioned on generally consistent building lines. The street is long and straight and contains street trees as well as planting within front garden areas. These characteristics give the area a spacious and open feel with the general consistency in the age, detailing and building materials all contributing positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
4. The proposal includes for the demolition of the existing rear extension and an outbuilding and the construction of a single storey rear extension. This extension would be stepped at different levels and would occupy the width of the property other than the two courtyard areas. It would also have an asymmetrical roof design with a green landscaped roof.
5. The extension would have a projection of around 14.3m beyond the original rear elevation of the appeal dwelling. I acknowledge that this would triple the size of the original ground floor/lower ground floor footprint. The stepped form of the extension would, however, ensure its height appears modest, as acknowledged by the LPA. There are a variety of rear extensions of differing lengths along the terrace row that the appeal site forms part of. Although none would have the length of this proposal, the reducing height of the extension as it extends towards the rear, where it would have an eaves height that would be similar to the height of the existing fence, would ensure that it would not appear excessively long. The extension, being partially sunken into the garden, would ensure it appeared as a subordinate addition to the elevated two storey dwelling and not compete visually with it.
6. I recognise that the proposal would have an unusual roof form with it sloping in different directions and with differing pitches. The Council reference other extensions on the terrace and state that they consist of symmetrical pitched or small flat roofs. From my site observations, I was able to see that extensions along the rear, including on one of the adjoining properties comprised of a pitched roof but with the rear extension having differing heights and roof pitches. The main roof on the appeal dwelling also has an asymmetrical form at the rear and in this context, I do not consider the proposed roof design would appear incongruous. From the rear garden, the roof of the extension would reflect the angles of the roof on the main building and the green roof design would assimilate well with the retained rear garden beyond, around 70% of which would be retained post appeal development.
7. The proposal would utilise render as the walling material which the Council does not consider to be representative of materials utilised in the Conservation Area. I acknowledge that render is utilised in the area but that stock brick buildings are a characteristic of the Conservation Area that contribute to its special

character. Whilst I note reference to maintenance issues and that policy should not be prescriptive, the appellant rightly identifies that development should respond to its context. I consider that the use of render, albeit on a small visible area of the extension, would detract from the quality of the Conservation Area. This is a matter which can however be satisfactorily addressed by condition.

8. The Council raise no concerns in relation to the replacement of the existing windows and front door. I have no reason to disagree with the timber sash form of the replacement windows and I also find the design of the replacement door to be acceptable, subject to further details, which can be the subject of a condition.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host property and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It would not conflict with Policies Q5, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, proposals that respond to the positive aspects of the local context and historic character. It would also not conflict with the Building Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document or with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons above and having taken into account all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

### **Conditions**

11. The Council have suggested a number of conditions. I consider the standard implementation condition and a condition for the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans to be necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I will impose a condition in relation to materials to match the existing dwelling and also a condition requiring details of the new door/windows in the interests of the character and appearance of the building and the Conservation Area.

*F Rafiq*

INSPECTOR