Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/25/3366981
48 Gipsy Hill, Lambeth, London SE19 1NL

- 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 Mr Mark Risner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
- The application reference is 25/00860/FUL.
- The development proposed is internal renovations, refurbishment works and rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for internal renovations, refurbishment works and rear extension at 48 Gipsy Hill, Lambeth, London SE19 1NL in accordance with the terms of the application reference 25/00860/FUL subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Procedural matters

2. The appellant has made an application for costs against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

3. The appellant has described the proposal as in the above heading. The Council, however, has referred to the development as the erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension with sedum roof and rooflight; external alterations to the existing extension; and internal renovations. From my inspection of the drawings, I consider that the Council's description more fully reflects the development sought. I have assessed the appeal on that basis.

4. The proposed ground floor layout plan[1] appears to show a wider and therefore larger paved area at the front of the dwelling than is currently in place. Since the other drawings that illustrate the proposal show the extent of the front paved area unchanged, this plan seems to be an anomaly. The appellant has also indicated at the appeal stage that no change is sought to the size of the paved area at the front of No 48. I have proceeded on that basis.

5. The site falls within the Gipsy Hill Conservation Area (CA). Accordingly, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA, as required by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

[1] Drawing number GA-P-104 entitled 'Proposed Layout Grd Flr Rev_A'

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

7. The appeal property is an end terrace dwelling of traditional style within the CA, which is predominantly residential in character. The CA derives its significance as a designated heritage asset mainly from the historic terraces, cottages and villas that line Gipsy Hill and the expansive views both up and down this road.

8. Like other properties in the same terrace, the front elevation of No 48 is rendered with stucco window architraves and the entrance placed to one side. At the rear, the main wall is brick and there are sliding sash windows in portrait orientation. There is also a 2-storey rear projection that has a brick base with timber framed glazing on 2 sides above and a mono pitched roof set well below the main eaves.

9. Although not identified as a heritage asset in its own right, No 48 and the terrace to which it belongs typify the traditional style and form of properties within this part of the CA. As such, the appeal dwelling, and the wider terrace add to the sense of unity and cohesion in the existing built form along Gipsy Hill. For these reasons, No 48 and the terrace positively contribute to character and appearance of the CA.

10. At the front, natural stone is to replace concrete tiles as the surface material to the paved area between the road and the main entrance, which would be appropriate. With no change sought to the size of the paved area, there would be no additional hard landscaping nor reduction to the opportunities for planting in the foreground to No 48 or as part of the local street scene. On that basis, the proposal would be in keeping with the character and qualities of the dwelling and the local streetscape.

11. At the rear, a single storey rear extension with a flat roof is to infill the gap between the 2-storey rear projection and the boundary of the site. Although the new addition would project beyond the rear build line of the appeal property, no significant visual disharmony would result. Firstly, the extension would be modest in height and so it would keep a low profile at the back of the main house. Secondly, with full length glazed units in the rear and side elevations this element of the appeal scheme would have a light-weight appearance.

12. The modest scale and appearance of the new extension would therefore contrast with the taller and more substantial 2-storey rear projection, which would retain visual primacy. By differentiating the new extension in this way, it would complement rather than visually compete with the host building notwithstanding its projection beyond the existing rear build line. Accordingly, the new extension would not conflict with the guidance in the Lambeth Design Guide Part 4 Building Alterations, Extensions and Retrofit (LDG).

13. The existing 2-storey rear projection would also be reclad and rebuilt with the walls finished in brick, brick bonds and render. The finished projection would be very similar in size and height to its existing counterpart and so it would remain clearly subordinate to the host dwelling, in line with the advice within the LDG.

14. A new black metal framed window in landscape orientation would wrap around a corner of the rear projection. Introducing a visually strong horizontal feature in the rear and side elevations of the projection would contrast with the vertical emphasis

of the main elevation to the dwelling that is partly established by its pattern of fenestration. Even so, existing rear projection similarly has large wraparound windows, and this element of the appeal scheme would be seen along with a largely glazed single storey extension. In that context, the new wraparound window would be a noticeable feature that would add visual interest to the overall rear elevation and support the contemporary twist given to its design.

15. The proposed fenestration to the new extension and the rear projection would contrast in style with the more traditional pattern of windows of the main house and others in the same terrace. However, that difference would not be harmful or jar with the appearance of the host dwelling or those in the vicinity of the site. From the rear of the site and neighbouring gardens, the new wraparound window would merely signal a modern style rear extension.

16. Insofar as the CA is concerned, its principal value is derived from the cohesive street frontages and the attractive views along Gipsy Hill, which would be largely unaffected by the proposal. There would be no significant harm to the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling or the terrace of which it forms part. The Council raises no objection to the remainder of the appeal scheme, which includes restoration of the render to the front elevation, re-grading of the external steps and various internal renovations. I have no reason to disagree with that view.

17. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. The character and appearance of the CA would be preserved. Accordingly, there is no conflict with Policies Q5, Q11 or Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 or the Council's LDG. These policies and guidance aim to ensure that development achieves good design, safeguards heritage assets and positively responds to the local context and historical character. It would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes well designed places and requires the historic environment to be conserved and enhanced.

Conditions

18. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings and to require that the development be carried out in accordance with them as this provides certainty. For the avoidance of doubt, no approval is given for the extent of the paved area at the front of the dwelling as shown on drawing number GA-P-104.

19. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is imposed to require that the external materials match those of the existing building. To protect the privacy of nearby residents, a condition is imposed to ensure that the flat roof of the extension is not used as a balcony or terrace.

Conclusion

20. Overall, there are no material considerations that indicate the development should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/25/3366981
48 Gipsy Hill, London SE19 1NL

Schedule of conditions

1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Refs GA-E-101_REV A, GA-E-102_REV A, GA-E-103_REV A,GA-E-104_REV A, GA-E-105_REV A, GA-E-201_REV A, GA-E-202_REV A, GA-E-203, GA-E-301 'Existing Section AA_REV A', GA-E-302, GA-P-100 'Proposed Site Plan REV A', GA-P-101, GA-P-103 'Proposed Lower Grd Flr Plan REV_A', GA-P-104 'Proposed Layout Grd Flr Rev_A', GA-P-105 'Proposed Layout_1st Flr_REV A', GA-P-201 'Proposed Front Elevation_REV A', GA-P-202 'Proposed Side Elevation_REV A', GA-P-203 'Proposed Rear Elevation_REV A', GA-P-301 'Proposed Section AA_REV A', GA-P-302 and the Location Plan, which shows the site edged red.

3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

4) The flat roof area of the single storey extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.