



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2025

by **F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20<sup>th</sup> August 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/25/3360908**

**Flat C, 31 Chantrey Road, Lambeth, London SW9 9TD**

- 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 Ruairi Boyle against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
  - The application Ref is 24/03254/FUL.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a rear dormer roof extension and installation of 2 rooflights to the front slope.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear dormer roof extension and installation of 2 rooflights to the front slope at Flat C, 31 Chantrey Road, Lambeth, London SW9 9TD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 24/03254/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 approved plans: drawing no's: 24002-XX-DR-A-0002 P01 (Site Location Plan), 2003 P04 (Proposed Drawings Plans & Elevations), 2004 P01 (Proposed Drawings Sections) and 2005 P03 (Proposed Drawings Roof Diagram).
  3. The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on the plans hereby approved.
  4. If Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) of net power of 37kW and up to and including 560kW is required on site during the course of demolition, site preparation and construction phases, it must comply with the emission standards set out in chapter 7 of the GLA's supplementary planning guidance "Control of Dust and Emissions During Construction and Demolition" dated July 2014 (SPG), or subsequent guidance. Unless it complies with the standards set out in the SPG, no NRMM shall be on site, at any time, whether in use or not, without the prior written consent of the local planning authority. The developer must register all NRMM at <https://nrmm.london/user-nrmm/register> prior to bringing it on to site and shall keep the register up to date by listing all NRMM used during the demolition, site preparation and construction phases of the development.

## **Main Issue**

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

## **Reasons**

3. The appeal property forms part of a three storey mid-terrace property which has a two storey outrigger to the rear. This built form is repeated along Chantrey Road where the use of a consistent palette of materials, as well as a general consistency in the design of properties, such as two storey front bays and other architectural detailing, contributes to a pleasant, coherent character to the area.
4. The proposed dormer would be situated on the rear main roofslope. With a width of around 4.11m, it would be set in from both sides and also away from the eaves. Although the set down from the ridge would be limited, the development would nevertheless retain appreciable areas of roof plane around it on three sides. As such, it would not appear to be an overly dominant addition and its scale, and form which consists of matching roof materials and slim profiling, would result in the dormer being a subordinate addition on the rear roofslope.
5. Overall, most of the pitched roofs on the rear of the terrace that the appeal site forms part of, and the rear of the terrace on Stansfield Road are undeveloped, but they do contain a range of dormer extensions which has introduced variation at roof level in the rear streetscene. Whilst the circumstances of these other developments differ from that of this proposal, they do nonetheless form the context in which the proposal would be seen which would not be visually harmful for the reasons set out.
6. I note the reference to illustrations of acceptable dormer extensions in the Lambeth Design Guide Part 4 Building Alterations, Extensions and Retrofit (Lambeth Design Guide), but these are not the only forms of acceptable development involving dormers. In this instance, as the proposal would retain sufficient areas of pitched roof, it would appear as a subordinate addition that would not dominate the host building.
7. The proposal would also include two roof lights, which given their size and positioning would have an acceptable appearance.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of its effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the area. As such, it would comply with Policies Q2, Q5, Q8 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035, which seek, amongst other matters, for dormers to be subordinate and with materials and detailing appropriate to the host building. It would also be compliant with the Lambeth Design Guide and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), which seek, amongst other matters, development that is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

## **Other Matter**

9. The Council has raised concerns on the proposal setting a negative precedent for similar development. I have however dealt with this appeal on its own particular merits, having regard to the evidence and specific circumstances of this case. Any future development would also be considered accordingly on its own merits.

### **Conditions**

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council, having regard to the six tests set out in the Framework. For the sake of clarity and enforceability, I have amended those suggested as appropriate.
11. A materials condition is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the host building and the area. A condition relating to the use of Non-Road Mobile Machinery is also required in the interests of air quality.

### **Conclusion**

12. The proposal would comply with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*F Rafiq*

INSPECTOR