



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 SEPTEMBER 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/25/3367488

15 Pyrmont Grove, Lambeth, London SE27 0BG

- 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 Catherine Phillips against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 25/00887/FUL.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear dormer on the main roof and outrigger, raising the ridge by 400mm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the loft conversion with rear dormer on the main roof and outrigger, raising the ridge by 400mm at 15 Pyrmont Grove, London SE27 0BG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00887/FUL, 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 drawing nos 2528/12 and 2528/13.
 - 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.

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.

Applications for costs

3. An application for an award of costs in relation to the subject appeal has been made by Catherine Phillips against the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth. This is subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Located on the east side of Pyrmont Grove, the property is a traditional Victorian two-storey, double height bay fronted, mid terrace dwelling. To the rear, the property has a two storey rear outrigger, which adjoins the neighbouring dwelling's outrigger, such that they contain a dual pitched roof with a central chimney. The outriggers sit at a lower height than the main dwellings, such that the properties contain split level floors. The outriggers are a feature that is repeated along the rear of the terrace and contributes positively to its character and appearance.
6. However, in several instances, these outriggers have been extended by upwards roof extensions, along with roof extensions to the main dwellings. Notably, the extension at No 13 was granted permission at appeal¹, and there are roof extensions at Nos 10, 11 and 12. Whilst the Council claims these do not benefit from planning permission, they also do not report of any enforcement investigations, and the current prevailing character of this row, and a group characteristic, contains several substantial upwards extensions.
7. The proposal is for 2 rear roof extensions and an increase in the ridge height by around 400mm. One of the rear roof extensions would project upwards above the rear outrigger, along with an extension of the chimney. The other would project about the main dwelling, which also incorporates the ridge height increase.
8. The roof extensions would be bulky and box like in appearance, and would fail to follow the newly adopted guidance in the Lambeth Design Guide Part 4 Building Alterations, Extensions and Retrofit (2023) (the Design Guide). However, the design would be consistent with the extensions at No 13, and the rest of the rear terrace row, such that it would respect the local architectural styles, and the distinctiveness of the area would be sustained. It would not unduly dominate the host building, and these material considerations lead me to conclude that the proposal would harmonise with the terrace row, and this would outweigh the conflict with the Design Guide.
9. The Council argue that No 13 was granted permission due to the benefit of a lawful development certificate fallback position. However, the appeal decision, read as a whole does not imply that this was the reason for granting planning permission, with there being reference to *"a number of roof extensions directly adjacent to the appeal property that both increase their ridgeline and benefit from substantial rear dormer extensions."*
10. In terms of the ridge height increase, the street is located on an incline, and there are several ridges that step down. As clear on site, No 14's ridge line steps up from No 15, and raising the ridge would be barely perceptible, marrying up with the height at No 14. Even if it were perceived, it would not be an incongruous, bulky feature in this location, and it would not dominate the host dwelling. Therefore, the architectural integrity of both the terrace and the property would be maintained.
11. Consequently, the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. This would comply with Policies Q5 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2021), insofar as they seek proposals that sustain and reinforce local distinctiveness and positively responds to the host building and other locally distinct forms.

¹ APP/N5660/D/23/3318655

Conditions

12. The plans are listed for certainty, and materials are required to match the existing building to ensure a suitable external appearance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR