



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2025

by **O Tresise MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/25/3361113

Unit 4, 50 Rodenhurst Road, London SW4 8AR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Emily Inez against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 24/03140/FUL.
 - The proposed development is described as 'Ground floor rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor rear extension at Unit 4, 50 Rodenhurst Road, London SW4 8AR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/03140/FUL, 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 plans: drawing no. 24047_P1_SLP, drawing no. 24047_P1_10 Rev A, drawing no. 24047_P1_13_03 Rev A, drawing no. 24047_P1_20 Rev A, drawing no. 24047_P1_31 Rev A, and Fire Safety Strategy.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. Revised plans were submitted to the Council prior to its decision. The Council has confirmed that it considered these revised plans and so I have determined the appeal on these revised plans. I am satisfied that no party is prejudiced by my doing so.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the main building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Rodenhurst Road is characterised by a group of two-storey semi-detached residential buildings, with varying materials and design. The properties are typically set back within their plots, with parking areas to the front. The pattern of the development generally follows the natural bend of the road and shares the building line along the road. Despite rear extensions being not uncommon, overall architectural integrity of these properties is well preserved, and they create a

consistent and cohesive character in this area and that makes a positive contribution to its local distinctiveness.

5. The appeal site comprises a single storey, one-bedroom flat located at the rear of 50 Rodenhurst Road. Part of the flat is one of the existing extensions of the host building, which has been subdivided into multiple flats. The existing rear extensions incorporate a mix of roof forms, including a dual pitched roof, a flat roof and a lean-to roof.
6. The proposed extension would be modest in scale, and its flat roof structure would follow the architectural characteristics of the existing rear extensions, without detracting from the character and appearance of the host building. Whilst the proposal would contribute to a degree of cumulative effect due to the presence of existing extensions, such effect would not be unduly harmful. This is because the proposed extension would be noticeably set back from the rear elevation of the existing extension to which it would be attached. In terms of material, London stock brick was suggested in the application form. However, the appellant has expressed a willingness to use render materials that match those of the host building. The use of which I find would adequately maintain the architectural integrity of the host building.
7. The neighbouring property, 48 Rodenhurst Road, also has a single storey rear extension. Although the proposed extension would project beyond the rear elevation of this neighbour's extension, its flat roof structure would sit slightly below the parapet wall of the neighbour's extension. As such, it would not create a discordant feature that would adversely affect the architectural integrity of this neighbouring property.
8. Properties along this section of road share similar characteristics with 50 Rodenhurst Road, many of which include rear extensions of various scales and forms. Although the appeal proposal would not exactly follow the design approach of the neighbours' extensions, the host building already has multiple additions with different forms and scales. Given its modest scale, the proposal would not undermine the overall character of the locality, either on its own or when viewed alongside other built forms.
9. An appeal decision¹ on the same site has been drawn to my attention. However, the appeal decision relates to a larger extension attached to a different part of the host building. Furthermore, its relationship to the adjacent building also differs. A separate appeal decision² at 33 Kestrel Avenue has also been mentioned. However, it is not seen within the same context. Therefore, I do not find them comparable to the appeal development before me and they do not change my conclusion on this main issue.
10. Overall, I therefore conclude that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the host building and the local distinctiveness of the area. Therefore, it would comply with Policies Q5, Q8 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2021). It would also comply with the guidance set out in the Lambeth Design Guide SPD (2023). Taken together, these seek to ensure development is designed to a good standard and is in keeping with the character of the area.

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/16/3144462

² Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/3304732

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time period for the commencement of development, it is necessary in the interest of certainty to list the approved plans. I have further imposed a condition requiring the external materials to be used in the construction of the development to match those on the original building, in the interest of visual amenity.
12. I note that the Council suggested a condition regarding the use of the roof area. However, the proposal would not create a new opening at the first-floor level, therefore it would not be necessary to impose such a condition.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

O Tresaie

INSPECTOR