



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025 by T Mansfield

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/25/3360021

117 St Julian's Farm Road, Norwood, Lambeth, London, SE27 0RP

- 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 Ms Tanya Robinson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 24/02939/FUL.
 - The development proposed is single and two-and-a-half storey domestic rear extension and general internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single and two-and-a-half storey domestic rear extension and general internal alterations at 117 St Julian's Farm Road, Norwood, Lambeth, London, SE27 0RP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/02939/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 drawing nos DC085-A.14.1 Version P3 and DC085-A.14.2 Version P3.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and on the living conditions of the occupants of 115 St Julian's Farm Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site consists of a detached two-storey property with accommodation in its roof space. Compared to its adjacent semi-detached neighbours, the appeal property is moderately taller and features a gable roof that contrasts with the hipped roofs of these properties. At its rear, the outrigger of the appeal property does not extend as deep as those of Nos 119 and 121, which appear prominently in views from Uffington Road. On this portion of St Julian's Farm Road, therefore,

the appeal property appears as unique in its design and different in appearance to its neighbours.

5. The proposed extensions would increase the height and depth of the rear of the property and cumulatively would be significant in scale. However, the height of the extension would be lower than the ridgeline of the existing main building and set down sufficiently to allow the form of the original building to still be perceived. Furthermore, the two-storey element would not extend across the full width of the appeal property. For these reasons, the extensions would appear as subordinate to the host building and would not unacceptably dominate it.
6. There are various forms of extension along this portion of the road, including sizeable part single, part two-storey extensions to Nos 119 and 121. Those extensions extend well into each garden at two storey height. In comparison, the two-and-a-half storey part of the appeal proposal, while taller than the extensions to the neighbours, would be of limited depth and width. From the public viewpoint on Uffington Road, the proposal would be seen in conjunction with those neighbouring extensions. Whilst there would be obvious design differences, this is already apparent in the contrasting designs of the dwellings. Therefore, the proposed development would respect and not be out of keeping with the character of the local area.
7. Consequently, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It therefore accords with Policies Q5 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (adopted 2021) which, respectively, support development proposals that respond to positive aspects of local context and do not support development which unacceptably dominates or overwhelms the host building.
8. The proposed development also accords with the guidance provided in the Lambeth Design Guide Part 4: Building Alterations, Extensions and Retrofit (2023) on achieving subordination.

Living conditions

9. The appeal property and No 115 are separated by tall vegetation within the garden of No 115 along the shared boundary, which is otherwise uncommon for rear gardens on this side of St Julian's Farm Road. In addition to the solid wooden fence that runs along the boundary, the vegetation provides a strong visual buffer between the properties, especially in seasons when the trees are in leaf.
10. At ground floor level of No 115, these elements, in combination with a rear extension on the other side of the property, contribute to a tunnelling effect that limits outlook from the rear window, funnelling views toward the rear garden of the property. At first and second floor levels, the rear windows are higher than the boundary fence and side extension, meaning they have a more open outlook. However, the vegetation still features prominently at this height, restricting outlook in the direction of the appeal site. At second floor level there is a window in the side of the bay facing the appeal site with no intervening screening, with a relatively open outlook across the rear of No 117.
11. The proposed single storey extension would project well beyond the rear of No 115 and would be visible from the rear ground floor window. It would however be set off the boundary, and the fence and vegetation would provide significant screening.

Therefore, it would not result in an undue sense of enclosure for this window compared with the existing situation.

12. The two-storey element of the proposal would be significantly shallower than the ground floor element, and therefore whilst it would be seen at an oblique angle, it would not appear as a dominant feature from the ground and first floor rear windows of No 115. Although the proposal would be clearly visible from the side pane of the second-floor bay window, the open outlook from the rest of this window would remain unchanged.
13. Consequently, the proposal would maintain an adequate outlook from the rear of No 115 and would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers in this respect. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy Q2 of the Local Plan, which supports development that provides for adequate outlook and avoids any undue sense of enclosure.

Conditions

14. I recommend conditions for commencement and requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans to provide certainty. As the materials are specified on the approved plans to match those used in the existing building, a condition requiring this is not necessary.
15. The Council has recommended a condition to restrict the flat roof areas of the development from being used as a balcony, terrace, sitting out or other amenity area to safeguard the privacy and amenities of adjoining occupiers. However, use of the flat roof as a balcony would generally require a separate grant of planning permission, given it would need a railing in line with building regulations. Therefore, the condition is not necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

T Mansfield

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

L McKay

INSPECTOR