



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2023

**by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/23/3329394**  
**243 Bedford Hill, London SW16 1LB**

- 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 V Marria against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
  - The application Ref 23/01311/FUL, dated 21 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2023.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey side extension to provide additional living accommodation.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Streatham Park and Garrad's Road Conservation Area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property forms one end of a group of 6 detached 2-storey houses. They are constructed of a mix of red brick, half-timbering and tile hanging and feature hipped roofs with prominent chimneys. They are set back from the road and face Tooting Bec Common on the opposite side of the road. The houses are situated within the Streatham Park and Garrad's Road Conservation Area (CA) which is notable for large, detached houses constructed in the 1930s in the Vernacular Revival style. The appeal property, and the group it forms part of, are good examples of the high levels of craftsmanship used at the time and together, and individually, they make a significant positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
4. The appeal property occupies a corner site and therefore its flank elevation and boundary are highly conspicuous from Bedford Hill, Garrad's Road and Abbotswood Road. The latter runs parallel to the side boundary of the appeal site. It is a residential street comprising quite imposing pairs of semi-detached red-brick houses, which are set back from the road giving the street a spacious quality.
5. The proposal would comprise the erection of a single-storey side extension. Its front elevation would be set behind the front elevation of the house and feature

false garage doors of a design that would mirror the doors in the front elevations of the neighbouring houses. The rear elevation would line through with the adjacent part of the existing rear elevation and include glazed bi-fold doors. The addition would feature a crown roof and extend close to the brick wall along the side boundary of the property.

6. The proposal would be subordinate in height, bulk and footprint to the host property and would be partially screened in views along Abbotswood Road by the boundary wall. However, the crown roof would be apparent above the wall. In this particular context, which is notable for an absence of development close to garden boundaries, it would be an overly prominent and incongruous addition to the street scene.
7. Due to its siting, height and size I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA. The harm to this heritage asset would be less than substantial. In these circumstances Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) requires me to weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. As the proposal simply provides additional space for the property's occupiers there are no public benefits associated with it.
8. For the reasons set out above the proposal is contrary to Policies Q5, Q11, and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (2021). Amongst other matters these policies seek to sustain and reinforce the borough's local distinctiveness and preserve or enhance conservation areas. There is also conflict with Policy Q14 which states that front gardens and prominent corner/side gardens are not considered appropriate for development unless there is no harm to visual amenity and established building lines are respected.

### **Conclusion**

9. I note the appellant has in some respects responded to the reasons an earlier planning application<sup>1</sup> was refused. However, for the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

*S Poole*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> LPA ref: 22/03180/FUL