



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2025

by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/25/3361499

417 Wandsworth Road, Lambeth, London SW8 2JP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Weatherstone c/o Marchmont Properties Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 24/03131/P1AA.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an additional storey with a flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site comprises a block of three single storey dwellings (Nos 417, 419 and 421). I am aware that three separate prior approvals were submitted for each of the dwellings and were all refused. However, from the information before me, I am not aware of appeals having been submitted for Nos 419 and 421. In any case, this appeal only relates to No 417 Wandsworth Road. My assessment reflects this and focusses solely on the construction of one additional storey at 417 Wandsworth Road.
3. The decision notice refused the appeal, in part, due to the omission of sectional plans. As part of the appeal, the appellant has provided a copy of these, the Council have commented on these and have withdrawn this reason for refusal.
4. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by the construction of additional storeys, subject to limitations and conditions set out in paragraphs AA.1 and AA.2. An application for a determination for prior approval in respect of development permitted under Part 1, Class AA must also be made by the developer.
5. In setting out the conditions, paragraph AA.2 (3)(a) requires before development that the developer applies to the local planning authority for prior approval as to (i) the impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises including overlooking, privacy and the loss of light, and (ii) the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the design and architectural features of (aa) the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, and (bb) any side elevation of the dwellinghouse that fronts a highway.

6. The use of the word 'including' means that the scope of the assessment is not limited to design and architectural features and that other factors could affect the external appearance of the dwellinghouse. Furthermore, the wording of (aa) and (bb) suggests that some assessment should be made of how the dwellinghouse would appear in the locality. This is the approach adopted by the Council and I have done the same.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are whether prior approval should be given having regard to the effect of the proposal on:
- the external appearance of the dwellinghouse and the locality; and
 - the amenity of residents of Goldsborough House with regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

Appearance

8. The appeal building is located in a prominent position on the corner of Union Grove and Wandsworth Road, with No 417 fronting Union Grove. No 417 is one of three properties that comprise the irregular hexagon shaped, horizontally clad, single-storey building.
9. The surrounding brick built buildings are considerably taller, at least three storeys in height. Whilst there is some variation in architectural styles of the buildings to the north east, the buildings that are seen to the rear of No 417, which includes Goldsborough House, have a pleasant architectural consistency, with the surrounding individual buildings having a consistent roof form.
10. Whilst the scale of the existing building is noticeably more limited than those in the surrounding streetscene, its limited scale successfully assists in reducing the prominence of the building in this corner location, maintaining a pleasant sense of openness, which contributes positively to the character of the area.
11. The proposal would increase the height of No 417 by adding an additional storey. The appellant has submitted 3D visualisations, whilst these are helpful in visualising the additional storey in the context of the surrounding built environment, they nevertheless show the additional storey on all 3 residential properties. That is not the proposal before me, which only relates to No 417. Given that there is no certainty the other two properties would receive planning permission, I cannot be certain that the proposal would appear as depicted on the submitted visualisations.
12. An additional storey at No 417 would harmfully disrupt the consistent height of the host building and would also appear at odds with the consistent height of roofscapes seen on surrounding buildings, appearing as an incongruous addition to the dwellinghouse and within the locality.
13. In a previous appeal,¹ which granted permission for the existing building, the Inspector came to the conclusion that the building's single-storey height, simple form, and detailing would have a low-key impact. I agree that the appeal building, now an established feature of the streetscene, does have a low-key impact due to

¹ Ref: APP/N5660/A/10/2124994

its single-storey height. However, an additional storey on the appeal property would make the building noticeably more prominent. Even though the proposal would use matching materials and reflect the existing design, the increase in height would no longer maintain the property's low-key appearance and would harmfully erode the sense of openness in this location, which would be of detriment to the character and appearance of the locality.

14. In conclusion, I find that proposal would have a harmful effect on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse and locality, and the proposal would not accord with the requirements of paragraph AA.2 (3)(a) (ii) of Class AA.

Amenity

15. The appeal building is located a short distance north of Goldsbrough House on the corner of Union Grove and Wandsworth Road, with windows facing the southern elevation of the appeal building.
16. The additional storey would increase the height of No 417 by approximately 2.75 metres. This would result in a change of outlook for the ground and first floor residential units of Goldsbrough House that face the appeal site, particularly the first floor occupiers that currently have views over the existing building. However, because the ground level is lower at the appeal site compared to Goldsbrough House, and due to the irregular hexagonal shape of the building, views from the windows at Goldsbrough House would still be possible towards the north east and north west, as such, the proposal would not unduly dominate the outlook of occupiers in Goldsbrough House, nor result in any undue sense of enclosure.
17. Moreover, the height of the proposed additional storey would not intersect a 25 degree line take from the centre window on the ground floor north elevation of Goldsbrough House, with the submitted shadow study also demonstrating that there would be no adverse overshadowing effects caused by the proposal. Consequently, I am satisfied that sufficient natural light would be afforded to the rooms facing the south elevation of the appeal proposal.
18. Whilst noting that the Council, in part, refused previous applications on the site for two-storey development due to adverse amenity impacts for the occupiers of Goldsbrough House, I have very limited information on those applications and cannot be sure how those compare to the appeal scheme. They therefore do not alter my assessment which has been determined on its own merits.
19. Drawing the above points together, I conclude that the amenity of the residents of Goldsbrough House with regard to outlook and light would not be unacceptably compromised. The proposal would accord with the requirements of paragraph AA.2 (3)(a) (i) of Class AA.

Other Matters

20. Matters relating to the accuracy of the Officers Report are noted. However, I have conducted my own site visit and carefully reviewed the submitted documentation, thus the discrepancies within the officer report have not affected my assessment of the proposal.
21. I note the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that planning decisions should support opportunities to use the airspace above existing residential premises and that the proposal would provide additional living

accommodation. However, this does not outweigh the adverse impact resulting from the external appearance of the proposal on the dwellinghouse and locality, with the Framework also seeking development that is well-designed. The appellant has also referenced the Lambeth Local Plan (2021) but I have not been directed to any specific policies.

Conclusion

22. Given my findings above with regard to the effect of the proposal on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse and the locality, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Bennett

INSPECTOR