



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2018

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th August 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/18/3196507
62 Harleyford Road, London SE11 5AY

- 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 Mr Devon Buchanan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 17/04292/FUL, dated 4 September 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2017.
 - The development proposed is addition of additional storey at roof level to create second floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for addition of additional storey at roof level to create second floor at 62 Harleyford Road, London SE11 5AY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/04292/FUL, dated 4 September 2017 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 following approved plans: Location Plan 1:1250, Existing Ground and First Floor Plans Drawing No SO-763-01, Existing Elevations Drawing No SO-763-02, Proposed South, Existing Front Elevation and Proposed Front Elevation Drawing No SO-763-09 and Proposed North, South and Rear Elevations and Second Floor Plan Drawing No SO-763-10.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details 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.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the:
 - character and appearance of the area bearing in mind it would be within the Vauxhall Conservation Area;
 - living conditions of nearby residents with particular regard to light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling. It is constructed of yellow stock brick with stucco cornice to its parapet and attractive traditional fenestration. It is within the Vauxhall Conservation Area.
4. In accordance with the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. Moreover, paragraph 193 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of new development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
5. The CA is extensive and characterised by a mix of residential areas and commercial buildings. The traditional buildings are of a variety of styles and ages grouped together in a number of sub areas where buildings of varied scale generally display consistent architectural details and materials. In my view, the significance of the CA is derived from its evolution around Vauxhall Bridge and the architectural detailing and variation of the buildings within it.
6. I acknowledge the appeal property once formed part of a wider terrace of three. However, it is now on the end of a small group of buildings comprising No 60a Harleyford Road (No 60a) a detached three storey dwelling and Nos 48-60 Harleyford Road (Nos 48-60) a row of tall terraced properties some converted to flats which partly has a mansard roof, part butterfly roof and a parapet wall detail similar to that of the appeal building.
7. I accept that variation in roof height is a positive feature of this part of the CA. However, whilst the proposal would increase the height of the appeal building to just taller than No 60a; Nos 48-60 would still be significantly taller with its own varied roof form. Thus the variation in height at roof level would be retained in this part of the CA. Furthermore, the proposal would be finished in matching materials, would have matching decorative windows and would incorporate an identical parapet and cornice feature at roof level to that of the existing building and in-keeping with the wider group of buildings.
8. I therefore find the proposal would not harm the varied street scene and would reflect the traditional features of the existing property and those of traditional properties nearby. It would be a relatively modest addition, which would neither dominate nor overwhelm the appeal property. Thus the proposal would not harm and therefore would preserve the character, appearance and significance of the CA.
9. Thus for the reasons given, the proposed extension would accord with the aims of Policies Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) (LP) which seeks to ensure building alterations and extensions are well designed and the character and appearance of conservation areas is preserved. For the same reasons it would also accord with the aims of the Vauxhall Conservation Area Statement (2016) and the Lambeth Supplementary Planning Document on Building Alterations and Extensions (2015) (SPD).

Living conditions

10. No 60a has a tall and deep flank elevation adjacent to the appeal site boundary. That elevation has no windows in it, thus there would be no impact on light enjoyed inside No 60a.
11. Whilst the proposed extension would be to the north east of the private outdoor space of No 60a, it would be some distance away. With regard to the dwellings on Percival Mews, those properties are also some distance away and there is mature landscaping within the rear garden of the appeal property.
12. Overall, when viewed in the context of the existing two storey appeal building and the three storey No 60a the proposed development would have a negligible impact upon light enjoyed by the occupiers of the No 60a and the occupiers of the dwellings on Percival Mews when using either their internal or external living spaces.
13. Thus even though there are no detailed contextual drawings or data from a daylight/sunlight study before me, I am satisfied that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of nearby residents with particular regard to light. The proposal would therefore accord with the aims of Policy Q2 of the LP which seeks to ensure new development does not harm the living conditions of nearby residents. For the same reason it would also accord with the aims of the SPD.

Other Matters

14. I have noted the evidence with regard to the appellant's personal circumstances. However, irrespective of such I would have reached the same conclusions.

Conditions

15. The conditions imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council but with some variation in the interests of clarity and precision having regard to the advice on imposing conditions in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
16. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition is also necessary to ensure the materials are agreed in the interest of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given, having had regard to all other matters raised the proposed development would accord with the development plan. I therefore conclude the appeal should be allowed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR