

## PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 01/05/2018 AND 31/05/2018

Council ref.	Appeal type	Address	Proposal	Decision type	Officer recommendation	Decision date	Appeal decision
16/05844/FUL	Non-determination - Town Planning	37 Hainthorpe Road London SE27 0PL	Demolition of the existing building and erection of a 2 storey building with lower ground floor and loft space to provide 4 self-contained flats and erection of a 2 storey dwelling house with lower ground floor, together with the provision of bin/cycle storage, landscaping and boundary treatment with amenity spaces.	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	22.05.2018	Appeal Dismissed

The Inspector noted that the Council issued a Decision Notice subsequent to the appeal being lodged against the failure of the Council to determine the application. Due to this, the decision cannot be given full weight as the Council was not in a position to formally determine the application at that point. The Council submitted a Statement of Case during the appeal process, which the Inspector has taken as the Council's formal position on the application, should they have been able to make a determination.

The Inspector noted the Council's Statement of Case, considering the main issues to be: the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, impact on the living conditions of future and neighbouring occupiers, whether adequate provision for cycle storage has been made, and, whether the development has adequately address matters related to flood risk.

The Inspector disagreed with the Council in that, the proposed contemporary design and detached nature of the proposal would not reflect that existing in the surrounding area, as the existing building is detached itself and is therefore uncharacteristic of its surroundings. Further, the Inspector concluded that the massing, lightwells, mansard roof and contemporary materials would not harm the visual amenity and character of the surrounding area.

The Inspector considered that there would be an acceptable impact in terms of Daylight and Sunlight attained by neighbouring properties; however the proposed first floor window and second floor Juliet balcony would significantly overlook existing private amenity space to No. 1 Dodbrooke Road and would therefore be unacceptable in this respect.

The Inspector noted that the proposed 'Flat 4' would fail to achieve the 50sqm requirement of the Nationally Described Space Standards (2015) and the London Plan Housing SPG requirement. On the proposed external amenity space, he considered that the degree of overlooking which would occur from other flats within the complex, would be similar to that experienced within suburban London and would not result in an adverse impact on the living conditions of future occupiers.

The Inspector stated that cycle parking can be addressed through the implementation of planning conditions and should therefore not be used as a reason for refusal. Further, it was considered that storage of cycles within a basement apartment would not result in an insurmountable obstacle to future occupiers. The Inspector stated that matters of waste and recycling storage can be addressed via planning conditions also.

The Inspector stated that the information provided on the self-contained basement flat's flood risk is proportionate to the application and a fully detailed scheme of flood protection could be submitted through the implementation of a planning condition.

The Inspector dismissed the appeal, concluding that the proposal would have an adverse impact upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, their privacy and would fail to

**PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 01/05/2018 AND 31/05/2018**

Council ref.	Appeal type	Address	Proposal	Decision type	Officer recommendation	Decision date	Appeal decision
--------------	-------------	---------	----------	---------------	------------------------	---------------	-----------------

provide an appropriate minimum level of usable floorspace for all proposed units.

17/03391/VOC	Conditions - Town Planning	British Film Institute South Bank London SE1 8XT	Variation of conditions 6 (approved plans), 10 (maximum luminance levels) and 13 (no moving images/text or special effects) of planning ref 16/05064/ADV (Display of 9 replacement externally illuminated poster signs and 1 freestanding sign.) Granted on 18.11.2016.  Variation sought: Amendments to facilitate advertisements with higher luminance levels, and special effects in specified locations.  (1st revision of 17/00433/VOC)	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	15.05.2018	Appeal Withdrawn
--------------	-------------------------------	---	--	--------------------	-------------------	------------	------------------

Appeal Withdrawn

17/01088/FUL	Refusal - Town Planning	112-113 Lower Marsh London SE1 7AE	Erection of a two-storey roof-top extension at rear first floor level to provide 2 flats.	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	04.05.2018	Appeal Dismissed
--------------	-------------------------	---	---	--------------------	-------------------	------------	------------------

The Inspector considered the main issues of this appeal to be: the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Lower Marsh Conservation Area, living conditions, parking availability and highway safety in the area, adequate provision for cycle, refuse and recycling storage and, adequate provision for energy efficiency.

The Inspector noted that the appeal site is located immediately to the south of Waterloo Station Approach Road within the Lower Marsh Conservation Area. Previous planning applications were referenced, however, the Inspector considered that the proposed development would be incongruous in not having a street frontage, would represent a larger structure from Station Approach Road and would infill and blur the boundaries between plots at Nos. 110 to 111 and Nos. 112 to 113, to the detriment of the historic rhythm of the street and views in to the Conservation Area.

The Inspector acknowledged the proposed replacement of the acoustic fence with a building of approximately 6.2m in height. However, he considered that the additional storey would be visually overbearing and considerably higher than the both the 2016 planning permission and the existing fence. He also stated that, outlook from the development would be unacceptable, daylight and sunlight had not been assessed by either party and could therefore not be addressed. Though the Inspector considered that the proposal would provide sufficient storage space, it would not provide an acceptable level of privacy for occupiers.

The Inspector noted that no parking spaces are proposed on the site to serve the proposed development, and, though there are no spaces for the existing flats on the site, there are good local public transport links within easy walking distance. The Inspector noted the CPZ in the area and the Lower Marsh Street Market, which both restrict the availability of parking. He

## PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 01/05/2018 AND 31/05/2018

Council ref.	Appeal type	Address	Proposal	Decision type	Officer recommendation	Decision date	Appeal decision
--------------	-------------	---------	----------	---------------	------------------------	---------------	-----------------

therefore stated that the development must be demonstrated to be car-free and future occupiers would be unable to apply for parking permits, by way of a legal agreement. Therefore, in the absence of an effective and enforceable planning obligation to ensure that the proposed development would not be occupied by people who hold a car parking permit, it was concluded that the proposed development would cause harm to parking availability and highway safety in the area.

The Inspector noted that the proposed development would provide 8 spaces for cycle storage at first floor level, and concluded that this would be onerous and inconvenient, forcing future occupiers to negotiate a flight of stairs with their bicycles. Similarly, the Inspector noted that the provision of refuse and recycling storage at first floor level, though immediately convenient for the future occupiers of the proposed flats, considered that, the timber structure would not be robust enough to allow for adequate maintenance and cleaning and, to inhibit the entry of vermin. Further to this, he stated that, the structure would unacceptably lie directly adjacent to 2 roof terraces for existing flats with potentially harmful effects in terms of odour and outlook for these occupiers, as well as, the proposed location requiring the bins to be pulled through the building, via the stairs and through a number of doors to reach the collection point.

The Inspector considered that, in terms of the proposed energy efficiency measures, as based on the information set out in the submitted Design and Access Statement and the requirements of the Building Regulations, there was no fundamental conflict with Policy EN4 of the Local Plan, Policy 5.2 of the London Plan, and the SDCSPG and, subsequently concluded that the proposed development would make adequate provision for energy efficiency.

The Inspector subsequently dismissed the appeal.

17/02550/FUL	Refusal - Town Planning	Food Kiosk Opposite London Eye, The Queen's Walk London SE1	Retrospective application for alterations to existing shopfront, including; the replacement of the existing window/counter aperture with new double leaf frameless glazed sliding doors, the installation of new timber cladding to match existing, the reinstatement of metal plinth; together with the change of use of the land to the west of the kiosk for the siting of associated tables and chairs.	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	22.05.2018	Appeal Dismissed
--------------	-------------------------	---	---	--------------------	-------------------	------------	------------------

The Inspector considered the main issues of this appeal to be: whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the South Bank Conservation Area, and, the setting of the grade II\* listed County Hall.

The Inspector noted the presence of the tables, chairs and barriers adding further to the level of visual intrusion caused by the development. He considered the prominent colour and number of tables and chairs is magnified by the green mesh barriers. While they represent a reduction in the number of tables and chairs previously permitted and though may be hardwearing and not cause a hazard to pedestrians, it was considered that the lesser amount of furniture in the form of tables, chairs and barriers still causes harm to the setting of County Hall and the character and appearance of the SBCA due to the level of clutter it creates.

The Inspector noted despite the reinstatement of the metal plinth, the use of timber cladding, and reductions in glazing and lighting since previous applications, not only does it have considerably more glazing than its neighbour when the glazed doors are closed, but it is much more obtrusive during opening hours. Due to the internal lighting and the green and white

## PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 01/05/2018 AND 31/05/2018

Council ref.	Appeal type	Address	Proposal	Decision type	Officer recommendation	Decision date	Appeal decision
--------------	-------------	---------	----------	---------------	------------------------	---------------	-----------------

colour of the kiosk's interior, whilst relating to its corporate brand, the kiosk is considerably more visually intrusive than its neighbouring kiosk.

Furthermore, the Inspector considered the development more prominent and unsympathetic than the kiosk's previous appearance as Café Zen, as shown in the plans provided with the appeal, and as Café Manga, as shown in the SBCAS. While the alterations could have resulted in the 2 kiosks being mirrored in their design, the alterations described instead result in the paired kiosks being somewhat at odds with one another.

The Inspector dismissed the appeal.

17/00836/FUL	Refusal - Town Planning	Acre House 10 - 16 Acre Lane London SW2 5SG	Erection of an additional storey to provide a fifth floor creating two self-contained flats together with the extension of the lift and stairs from the fourth floor and creation of a private winter garden to the front elevation	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	04.05.2018	Appeal Dismissed
--------------	-------------------------	--	---	--------------------	-------------------	------------	------------------

The Inspector considered the main issues to be; whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Brixton (BCA) and Trinity Gardens (TGCA) CAs and the setting of the Grade II Listed Lambeth Town Hall, the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of future occupiers, with particular regards to overheating and noise, the effect of the proposed development on the highway in regards of safety and parking, and whether the proposal would make adequate provision for cycle, refuse and recycling storage.

The proposal was to erect an additional storey to create 2 additional self-contained residential units; 1x1-bed/2person and 1x2-bed 4 person. The appellant had sought to submit amended plans in an attempt to address the reasons for refusal. However the Inspector referred to the procedural guidance on appeals and stated that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme. The appeal was therefore dealt with using the drawings assessed by the LPA.

The building on the application site, known as Acre House, was originally 4-storeys had previously been extended by way of an additional storey to provided additional residential units.

The Inspector acknowledged the setting of the application site noting the proximity of the Listed Town Hall and the adjacent CAs and observed that Acre House is highly visible in views down Acre Lane in both directions and despite the additional fourth floor being set back from the Acre Lane elevation it is visible beyond the roof of the neighbouring Universal Pentecostal Church. The addition of a further floor would appear incongruous and would draw the eye upwards to a substantially glazed and somewhat alien structure of 2-storeys in height. The proposed development would appear overly dominant and bulky when viewed in context with its neighbours and the Town Hall opposite. In conclusion, the Inspector found that the proposal would be contrary to the Lambeth Local Plan.

With regards to the proposed living conditions the Inspector found that there are no exceptional circumstances that would justify one of the proposed units being single aspect and that this combined with the less than 2.5m floor to ceiling height would result in a unit that would be difficult to ventilate. In addition, the single aspect unit would face Acre Lane would be vulnerable to relatively high levels of noise. In conclusion, the Inspector found that the proposed development would cause harm to future occupiers and would be contrary to the

**PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 01/05/2018 AND 31/05/2018**

Council ref.	Appeal type	Address	Proposal	Decision type	Officer recommendation	Decision date	Appeal decision
--------------	-------------	---------	----------	---------------	------------------------	---------------	-----------------

London Plan and Lambeth Local Plan.

With regards to the highways impacts the Inspector found that the lack of appropriate cycle storage and in the absence of a S106 agreement to restrict access to car parking permits the proposed development was contrary to the objectives of the London Plan and the Lambeth Local Plan.

With regards to the refuse and recycling storage the Inspector found that the facility proposed would be unwieldy and would not be functional or suitably ventilated and was therefore contrary to the objectives of the Lambeth local Plan.

The appeal was subsequently dismissed.

17/00383/FUL	Refusal - Town Planning	41 Stockwell Park Road London SW9 0DD	Redevelopment of the garage site and rear garden of the property accessed via Groveway , involving the demolition of existing garages and erection of 3 storey building plus lower ground floor to provide 4 self-contained flats, with provision of cycle stands, refuse store and landscaping.	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	10.05.2018	Appeal Dismissed
--------------	-------------------------	---	--	--------------------	-------------------	------------	------------------

The Inspector considered the main issues of this appeal to be: the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, the effect on the living conditions of adjacent occupiers, on-street parking and risk of flooding.

The Inspector noted the design of the building would have a heavy appearance which jars with the streetscene and is accentuated by it being at the junction of two roads. He noted that the proposed development would be much more prominent than the existing garage block occupying much of the gap through to back gardens. He did not object to a front boundary of a wall and railings, and considered the blocks construction would likely have a significant adverse effect on T2s RPA and its future contribution to the streetscene, together with its loss would be detrimental. Overall, the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

The Inspector considered that the development would result in a confined external garden for the adjacent property, be very enclosed and offer users limited outlook. The users of the garden would also experience a loss of privacy when the rear balconies are in use, which, are in close proximity to the adjacent garden.

However, the Inspector was satisfied with the content of the car free unilateral undertaking, allowing those who already have a parking permit in the Borough to retain theirs, if they move to the proposed development.

The Inspector was satisfied that the occupiers of the development would not be subject to any unacceptable risk of flooding.

The Inspector noted that the development appellant would provide 100% affordable housing, and in the absence of a planning obligation in relation to affordable housing, should not weigh against the development.

**PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 01/05/2018 AND 31/05/2018**

Council ref.	Appeal type	Address	Proposal	Decision type	Officer recommendation	Decision date	Appeal decision
--------------	-------------	---------	----------	---------------	------------------------	---------------	-----------------

The Inspector went on to dismiss the appeal.

17/04243/FUL	Refusal - Town Planning	45 Rodenhurst Road London SW4 8AE	Enlargement of existing first floor rear window.	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	24.05.2018	Appeal Allowed
--------------	-------------------------	---	--	--------------------	-------------------	------------	----------------

The main issue in this appeal was the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, including consideration of whether the proposal would lead to harm to the visual amenity of the occupants of neighbouring residential buildings.

The Inspector considered that the scale of the projecting bay window would appear modest given total size of the host building. The use of glass in its construction would replicate materials used elsewhere on the rear elevation. Given the limited extent of its projection, it would not significantly compromise the pattern of rear returns found on the host property and those that surround it.

As a result, the Inspector allowed the appeal.

17/04244/FUL	Refusal - Town Planning	45 Rodenhurst Road London SW4 8AE	Installation of a rear projecting glass box at first floor level.	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	22.05.2018	Appeal Allowed
--------------	-------------------------	---	---	--------------------	-------------------	------------	----------------

The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, including consideration of whether the proposal would lead to harm to the visual amenity of the occupants of neighbouring residential buildings.

The Inspector considered the scale of the projecting bay window would appear modest given total size of the host building. The use of glass in its construction would replicate materials used elsewhere on the rear elevation. Given the limited extent of its projection, it was considered it would not significantly compromise the pattern of rear returns found on the host property and those that surround it.

He noted it would be visible from both habitable windows in neighbouring properties and their garden areas, but it would be set well away from the relevant site boundaries. It would not therefore appear unduly prominent or overbearing. In consequence, it was considered would be no harm to the living conditions of the occupants of surrounding residential properties through any loss of visual amenity.

Therefore the Appeal was allowed.

17/05217/FUL	Refusal - Town Planning	84 Heybridge Avenue London SW16 3DT	Erection of a single storey ground floor rear and side infill extension.	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	04.05.2018	Appeal Allowed
--------------	-------------------------	---	--	--------------------	-------------------	------------	----------------

## PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 01/05/2018 AND 31/05/2018

Council ref.	Appeal type	Address	Proposal	Decision type	Officer recommendation	Decision date	Appeal decision
--------------	-------------	---------	----------	---------------	------------------------	---------------	-----------------

The Inspector considered the main issues of this appeal to be whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

The Inspector was of the opinion that the proposed extension would be a relatively modest alteration to this two storey property and would not unacceptably dominate or overwhelm the host building and, that the extension should be set in from the edge of the house to remain subordinate. Aside from one small area of roof, he considered that it would not be evident from within the public domain and would be of limited prominence from within private gardens.

However, the Inspector noted that the proposed bi-fold doors would not be in keeping with the detailing of the house, but considered that, whilst this would be the case, the addition would appear as a modern extension, that would contrast with the form and detail of the original.

The Inspector allowed the appeal.

17/03875/ADV	Refusal - Advert	Bus Shelter Outside 359 Brixton Road London	Display of an internally illuminated freestanding digital screen forum structure at one end of the bus shelter	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	02.05.2018	Appeal Dismissed
--------------	------------------	--	--	--------------------	-------------------	------------	------------------

The Inspector considered the main issue is the effect of proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including the Brixton Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings.

The Inspector noted the location of the existing bus shelter with the large, symmetrical, Grade II listed, 19th century three-storey terrace at Nos 341 - 361 Brixton Road, along with neighbouring complementary buildings of the same composition at Nos 337, 339, 363 and 365. He also observed that this part of the Conservation Area is characterised by the width of the road and large residential buildings on one side of the road being set back from the main highway. Noting that there are more active frontages on the western side of Brixton Road, while the listed buildings at Nos 337 - 365 are set back from Brixton Road, with a number of large trees providing visual separation from the street, the presence of street trees, when approaching the appeal site from the north, the existing bus shelter lies in the visual foreground of the listed buildings at 341 - 361 and 363 -365 beyond. The buildings and the shelter are viewed together in this view and from the western side of Brixton Road.

The Inspector considered that despite the proposed development replacing an existing static display panel and providing improvements in flexibility, energy consumption, and efficiency in terms of changing displays without visiting the appeal site, the introduction of a succession of static images would increase the prominence of the advertisement from Brixton Road. He also considered that it would appear visually intrusive and add to visual clutter in this sensitive location in the foreground of the aforementioned listed buildings within the Conservation Area.

The Inspector subsequently dismissed the appeal, stating that the proposal would compromise visual amenity and clutter in the public realm, and, diminish the setting and significance of heritage assets, including conservation areas and listed buildings.

**PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 01/05/2018 AND 31/05/2018**

Council ref.	Appeal type	Address	Proposal	Decision type	Officer recommendation	Decision date	Appeal decision
17/03869/ADV	Refusal - Advert	Bus Shelter Opposite 330 Kennington Park Road London	Display of internal facing digital display panel and static illuminated outer display panel.	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	02.05.2018	Appeal Dismissed

The Inspector considered the main issue of the appeal to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including St Marks Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings.

The Inspector noted that the appeal followed a previous appeal dismissal for a similar development which contained LED advertisement boards on both sides. The current appeal application removed the outer facing LED board. The Inspector considered that the introduction of successive static images would increase the prominence of the advertisement. The appellants intention to reduce illumination levels was noted, however, the proposal was considered to appear visually intrusive and add to visual clutter in this particularly sensitive location in the foreground of the aforementioned Grade II\* and II listed buildings.

The inspector went on to dismiss the appeal.

17/05456/FUL	Refusal - Town Planning	40 Canterbury Grove London SE27 0NY	Erection of a single storey ground floor rear and side infill extension; erection of a dormer to the rear roofslope and the rear return and installation of 2 rooflights to the front roof slope.	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	23.05.2018	Appeal Dismissed
--------------	-------------------------	---	---	--------------------	-------------------	------------	------------------

The Inspector considered the main issues of this appeal to be: the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the area, and on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants at No. 38 Canterbury Grove with reference to daylight and sunlight.

The Inspector noted the proposed dormer on the main roof would appear to extend across almost its full width and would be of a considerable scale and bulk, failing to be subordinate to the existing roof. The rear wall of the dormer would have a larger window than the existing window below it, which would add to visual harm of the proposed bulky dormer; it would be highly visible from a number of rear gardens of surrounding properties, thusly failing to preserve or enhance the character of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area.

The Inspector considered, given the dimensions of the dormer, and its siting at roof level, it would not result in any unacceptable effects on daylight or sunlight issues. He concluded that the open plan nature of the accommodation at the adjoining property, where rooms are served by a number of different windows, means the dormer would not have an unacceptable impact by way of loss of daylight. Furthermore, as the development would be located to the rear, which is broadly north-facing, there would be only a minimal loss of sunlight.

The Inspector however dismissed the appeal.

## PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 01/05/2018 AND 31/05/2018

Council ref.	Appeal type	Address	Proposal	Decision type	Officer recommendation	Decision date	Appeal decision
17/06198/FUL	Refusal - Town Planning	1 Grayscroft Road London SW16 5UP	Alterations to existing ground floor rear extension including installation of new roof with roof lights, level parapet to flank walls and altered rear door profile.	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	29.05.2018	Appeal Dismissed

The Inspector considered the main issues of this appeal to be the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 3 Grayscroft Road (No.3), with particular regard to visual impact, daylight and sunlight.

The Inspector considered that, No.3 is an inner terraced dwelling whose rear windows have a north easterly aspect and whose rear garden does not exceed six metres in width. The attached dwelling to the southwest, 5 Grayscroft Road (No.5), has a single storey rear extension which is some 4.5 metres deep and three metres high. Due to its height, depth and proximity the flank wall of this extension is prominent and has an enclosing impact within the rear garden and from the rear facing ground floor windows at No.3, clearly resulting in a modest loss of daylight and sunlight within the immediately adjacent rear garden and room.

The Inspector noted that, the Appeal dwelling adjoins No.3 immediately to the north/northwest. At the time of the Appeal site visit, the Appeal property was undergoing internal and external works. The rear ground floor wall and part of the former rear extension had been removed, as has part of the former parapet wall that formed the side wall of the former conservatory extension. Due to its reduced depth, the retained part of this parapet wall only has a modest impact on the sense of enclosure within the rear garden and in the outlook from the adjacent ground floor rear room at No.3. It results in a modest loss of daylight and sunlight within the immediately adjacent rear garden area and adjacent room at No.3.

As the former conservatory and part of the parapet wall have been demolished, the proposed extension cannot be compared to the former rear extension. This is because the former conservatory would require planning permission, if it was to be rebuilt and the merits of any such proposal would need to be assessed at that time and thus falls outside the scope of this Appeal. However, it is clear from the retained section of the parapet wall that its receding height provided some visual interest and created a sense that the enclosed gap to the rear of No.3 opened up as it progressed into the rear garden area.

The Inspector considered that, the parapet wall would be partially reused and partially rebuilt. It would project 4.3 metres into the rear garden and it would have a uniform height of some 3.2 metres, which would be slightly higher than the extension at No.5. Due to its combined depth and uniform height the proposed extension would be visually stark. Together with the existing extension at No.5 the proposed extension would create a tunnel effect, which would have an unduly enclosing and overbearing impact on the outlook into the rear garden from the immediately adjacent garden area and rear facing rooms at No.3. This would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.3.

He also noted that, the proposed extension would be both single storey in height and located to the north/northwest of No.3. As a result, the proposed extension would only result in a modest level of loss of daylight and early morning sunlight within the adjacent rear garden and rooms at No.3. Whilst this would not amount to a reason for dismissing this Appeal, the resultant detrimental impact of the proposed development, was noted.

The Inspector considered that, this harm would outweigh the benefits for the future occupiers of the property that would result from the additional accommodation, as well as

**PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 01/05/2018 AND 31/05/2018**

Council ref.	Appeal type	Address	Proposal	Decision type	Officer recommendation	Decision date	Appeal decision
--------------	-------------	---------	----------	---------------	------------------------	---------------	-----------------

unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.3 due to its overbearing and enclosing visual impact.

The Inspector subsequently dismissed the appeal.

17/06232/FUL	Refusal - Town Planning	131 Milkwood Road London SE24 0JB	Erection of a hip-to-gable roof extension, rear dormer and rear extension over 1st floor outrigger, a first floor side extension and the installation of 2 rooflights to front elevation.	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	23.05.2018	Appeal Dismissed
--------------	-------------------------	---	---	--------------------	-------------------	------------	------------------

As a preliminary matter, the Inspector noted that approved elements of an LDCP had not been constructed. As the proposed elements would be physically and functionally attached to the appeal development, the Council were correct to include all elements as part of the planning application scheme.

The Inspector considered the main issues of this appeal to be: the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the host building and the terrace, and, the visual amenities of the surrounding area.

The Inspector noted from the south, that this proposed extension would appear as a box alongside the retained hipped roof and the irregular shaped parapet wall. Its window would be larger than and totally out of alignment with the first floor window below. From the east, due to its height and roof design the extension would fail to respect or respond to the more modest proportions and design of the existing outrigger. In addition, it would project in front of the windows serving the proposed dormer extension. From the front, the hip to gable extension, together with its large rooflights would appear visually awkward alongside the shallow pitched roof of the adjoining property. The eaves line of the outrigger extension would project above the eaves line of the adjacent property and its pitched roof would be at odds with the proposed hip to gable extension.

The Inspector considered that, the resultant dwelling would appear disjointed, poorly proportioned and unbalanced. It would dominate the roof of the property and would totally fail to respect or reflect the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace, the street scene or the locality.

As a result, the Inspector dismissed the appeal.

17/05957/FUL	Refusal - Town Planning	46 Kirkstall Road London SW2 4HF	Installation of 2 rooflights to the front elevation.	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	23.05.2018	Appeal Allowed
--------------	-------------------------	--	--	--------------------	-------------------	------------	----------------

The Inspector considered the main issue of this appeal to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of Telford Park Conservation Area (TPCA).

The Inspector noted the proposed two conservation style rooflights would be modest in size and would be fitted flush with the roof tiles. They would be viewed as being symmetrically sited on either side of the front gable projection and would sit below the ridge line of the front gable feature. In addition, they would respect the width of the window panes of the windows on the front elevation of the dwelling and the area above the central gable would remain free from windows or other additions.

**PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 01/05/2018 AND 31/05/2018**

Council ref.	Appeal type	Address	Proposal	Decision type	Officer recommendation	Decision date	Appeal decision
--------------	-------------	---------	----------	---------------	------------------------	---------------	-----------------

The Inspector allowed the appeal, stating that the development would have no detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

17/05341/FUL	Refusal - Town Planning	5 Lancaster Avenue London SE27 9EL	Erection of single storey ground floor rear and side extensions.	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	23.05.2018	Appeal Dismissed
--------------	-------------------------	--	--	--------------------	-------------------	------------	------------------

The Inspector considered the main issues to be: the effect of the proposal on the host building and its building group, and the impact of the scheme on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 3 Lancaster Avenue. The applicant also made an appeal for costs against LBL stating a lack of site visit had resulted in an incorrect decision.

The Inspector considered the scale, irregular shape, projection and proposed fenestration of the proposal to fail to relate to the host building. Further, the proposed height of the side extension would be clearly visible from the streetscene and the flat roof would detract from the design and appearance of the host property. He also considered that the staggered side wall of the proposal, in conjunction with the 1m set in of the nearest habitable window at the neighbouring property and existing boundary treatment, would mitigate any impact on the amenity of No. 3.

In relation to the costs appeal, the Inspector stated that there is no statutory requirement for a site visit and that the submitted plans and aerial photographs would have been sufficient to judge the scale and positioning of the proposal. While ultimately disagreeing with the officers assessment on the second issue, the inspector considered the concerns were clearly informed and set out within the report.

The Inspector went on to dismiss the appeal and the costs appeal.

17/04947/FUL	Refusal - Town Planning	12 Fieldhouse Road London SW12 0HJ	Erection of a rear roof extension with rear dormers and the installation of 3 No. rooflights to the front slope. (Resubmission 17/03793/FUL)	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	22.05.2018	Appeal Dismissed
--------------	-------------------------	--	--	--------------------	-------------------	------------	------------------

The Inspector considered the main issues of this appeal to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace, the roofscape in the locality and the Hyde Farm Conservation Area (HFCA).

The Inspector noted that the proposed roof lights on the front roof-slope of the Appeal dwelling would be poorly positioned in relation to the existing hipped roof over the bay windows. They would also fail to align with the existing windows and front door below. At the same time, they would sit very close to the ridge line of the dwelling, within an area of the roofscape that is visually uncluttered.

For these reasons, despite their modest size, the proposed rooflights would appear top heavy, visually unbalanced and the overall roof would appear visually cluttered. As a consequence, the proposed rooflights would materially harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace and the roofscape within the locality. They would also result in some harm to the significance of the HFCA.

The Inspector noted that the proposed rear mansard roof and associated dormer windows would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace and would be

**PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 01/05/2018 AND 31/05/2018**

Council ref.	Appeal type	Address	Proposal	Decision type	Officer recommendation	Decision date	Appeal decision
--------------	-------------	---------	----------	---------------	------------------------	---------------	-----------------

readily assimilated into the rear garden environment. The acceptability of this part of the scheme would not however outweigh the harm that would be caused by the proposed rooflights.

However, because the rooflights would provide light and outlook to parts of the accommodation within the mansard roof extension they are not physically and functionally independent.

The Inspector went on to dismiss the appeal.

17/01340/FUL	Refusal - Town Planning	37 Hainthorpe Road London SE27 OPL	Demolition of existing building and construction of two semi-detached residential units and one detached residential unit, together with the provision of bin/cycle storage, landscaping and boundary treatment with amenity spaces.	Delegated Decision	Refuse Permission	25.05.2018	Appeal Withdrawn
--------------	-------------------------	--	--	--------------------	-------------------	------------	------------------

Appeal Withdrawn.

	Allowed	Dismissed	Mixed
Month total	4	12	0
Financial year to date	6	20	0