



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/25/3369899

120 Upper Tulse Hill, London SW2 2RR

- 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 David Bannister against the decision of the London Borough of Lambeth Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01023/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for an additional storey extension to create a master bedroom, dressing room and bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a mid-terrace house constructed post second world war of a quasi-modernist design signified by its fenestration and mono-pitched roof. There are some examples of mansard roof extensions within close proximity to it, including at 122 Upper Tulse Hill next door, along with nos128 and 130a; all of these have red brick party walls to their flanks with a pair of windows set within a slated roof and set the immediate context for the appeal proposal. I have also had regard to the other examples cited by the appellant, especially within Vibart Gardens and at 114 Chalice Way. I have not been provided with details of those proposals, and whilst the proposed scheme at 108 Upper Tulse Hill has been cited, and it not for me to comment on the appropriateness of this design or otherwise, it appears that that it was deemed permitted development; but ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits.
4. Overall I consider that the appeal proposal by itself would amount to a high quality design, however it cannot be viewed in isolation and the most immediate design cue for a mansard extension must be that at no122 immediately next door. Having regard to the other examples due south of the appeal site, I consider that the use of metal cladding and the greater height would appear incongruous when viewed against its immediate neighbour.

5. Therefore, whilst I accept that the character within the terrace is slightly varied, the proposal would add a further design concept to the mix which would appear confused within the street scene. Taking into account the relatively low stature of the host dwelling itself, particularly when viewed from the rear elevation, I consider that overall the proposed roof extension would not appear subordinate in form notwithstanding that the window proportions would generally reflect the original post war aesthetic.
6. It does not appear that the Council objects to the principle of a roof extension per se, and therefore I consider that there are other ways of making effective use of land. Consequently I consider that the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area and conflicts with Policies Q5 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2021 which seek to sustain the local distinctiveness of Lambeth, having regard to, amongst other things, siting, orientation and layout and relationship with other buildings and do not permit roof additions and mansards where they would harm the architectural integrity of the original building or its group.

Conclusion

7. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR