



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2025

by SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/25/3359927

14 Acland Crescent, Lambeth, London SE5 8EQ

- 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 Mrs Shini D'Costa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 24/02305/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Demolition of the garage and conservatory and erection of a single storey wrap-around extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Demolition of the garage and conservatory and erection of a single storey wrap-around extension at 14 Acland Crescent, Lambeth, London SE5 8EQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 24/02305/FUL and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A01 Rev A, A02 Rev A, A03 Rev A; A04 Rev A; A05 Rev A; A06; EX09.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have changed the description of the proposed development in the banner heading above to that used on the Decision Notice and Appeal Form, which provide greater clarity and accuracy.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the:
 - character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; and,
 - living conditions of the occupiers of 16 Acland Crescent (No.16), particularly in terms of creating a sense of enclosure and having an overbearing impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated within a predominantly residential street. The local streetscape is composed mainly of semi-detached properties interspersed with a number of detached dwellings. With the exception of the single storey side extension present at the attached pair No.16, the appeal dwelling and the attached pair maintain a reasonable degree of architectural symmetry and remain largely unaltered in form, which contributes positively to the character of the street.
5. The appeal proposal seeks to construct a single-storey wrap-around extension, effectively infilling the space between the flank elevation and the boundary and projecting 6 metres to the rear. At the rear, the extension would have a dual-pitched roof with an eaves and ridge height of approximately 3 and 4 metres respectively.
6. When viewed from the street, the proposal's single-storey form and setback from the front elevation would appear subordinate and maintain first-floor separation from the adjacent 12 Acland Crescent (No.12), avoiding any terracing effect. The use of matching materials would help to assimilate it into the host property. Given the existing side extension at No.16, it would preserve the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and integrate acceptably with, and preserve the character, of the street scene.
7. Several neighbouring properties have been subject to various extensions and alterations, including rear and wrap-around additions. The host dwelling has a rear conservatory and a detached garage positioned close to the rear elevation and no.16 has a single storey rear extension. Notwithstanding their planning history, these developments collectively contribute to the evolving character of the area. While there is a notable degree of variation in the form and scale of these additions, the original rear elevations of the dwellings generally remain discernible and legible, preserving a degree of visual coherence.
8. At the rear, the proposal would introduce a mass and height, reaching first-floor window level, greater than the surrounding rear extensions. This would result in a noticeable change to the rear elevation of the host dwelling. I acknowledge that the proposal would not appear subordinate in the strictest sense and would represent a more dominant intervention than is typical in the locality. In this regard, there is some conflict with Policies Q5 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (2021) (LLP), which seek to ensure development is subordinate in appearance to the host building.
9. Similarly, the proposal would depart in a limited extent from the guidance in the Lambeth Design Guide SPD (2023) (the SPD), which discourages wrap-around extensions that introduce excessive bulk or fail to achieve subordination. Nonetheless, it is necessary to consider the guidance flexibly in light of site-specific considerations that may justify a more context-led and proportionate response to the SPD's design parameters.
10. The rear elevation would not be visible from the public realm. The visual impact would be confined to a limited number of private vantage points, primarily from Nos. 12 and 16, and to a lesser extent from upper-storey rear facing windows on Ferndale Road. Where visible, the use of matching materials would assist in

assimilating the extension into the original rear elevation and the proposal would be read within a varied rear context that already features a range of extensions and alterations, including at No.16, thereby reducing any perceived incongruity or unbalancing impact.

11. I also afford significant weight to the fallback position identified by the Council, namely the prior approval granted under reference 23/03830/PDE for a single-storey rear extension projecting six metres in depth from the rear elevation. This development could be implemented at any time without further planning consent and represents a realistic prospect. Although it differs from the appeal proposal in omitting the side and wrap-around elements and having slightly reduced ridge and eaves heights, it would nevertheless result in a substantial increase in massing to the rear elevation. When considered alongside the proposed replacement of the existing detached garage, the overall spatial and visual impact would be broadly comparable to the appeal proposal. As such, the fallback is a material consideration that tempers the harm identified.
12. Taking into account the site-specific context, the limited visibility of the rear elevation, the presence of existing rear alterations, and the existence of a credible fallback position, I am satisfied that the appeal proposal would not result in material harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. Whilst there remains limited conflict with Policies Q5 and Q11 of the LLP and the SPD, the resultant harm is modest, localised to the rear elevation, and outweighed by material considerations in this instance.

Living conditions

13. No.16 has a single-storey rear extension of approximately 3 metres in depth, with two rear facing habitable room windows. The appeal proposal seeks to extend approximately a further 3 metres beyond this along the shared boundary.
14. While the proposed extension would be clearly visible above the boundary fence, the degree of additional projection beyond the existing extension at No.16 is relatively modest. When considered in conjunction with the proposed roof design, which slopes away from the shared boundary, I am satisfied that the proposal would not give rise to any unacceptable increased dominance, enclosure or overbearing impact harmful to the living conditions of occupiers of No.16.
15. Moreover, the increase in mass and roof height compared to the fallback position, no more than 0.2 metres at the eaves, would not materially alter the experience of the extension when viewed from No. 16. Given the fallback position's extant status, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in a perceptible increase in impact beyond what has already been deemed acceptable.
16. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not unacceptably harm the living conditions of occupiers of No.16, having had particular regard to a sense of enclosure or overbearing impact. As such, the proposal would not conflict with Policy Q2 of the LLP, which amongst other matters, requires development to provide adequate outlook and avoid an undue sense of enclosure.

Conditions

17. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests of paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework and advice in the

Planning Practice Guidance: Use of planning conditions. In addition to the statutory time limit condition, a condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary to provide certainty. A condition relating to materials is also reasonable and necessary in the interests of character and appearance.

Conclusion

18. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan but material considerations indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

SJ Desai

INSPECTOR