

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2025 by K Hole BA (Hons)

**Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/25/3367601**

**19 Lanercost Road, London SW2 3DP**

- 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 Jeremy Gordon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
  - The application Ref is 25/00916/FUL.
  - The development proposed is erection of hip-to-gable roof extension with rear dormer and rear terrace together with the installation of 5 rooflights to the front roof slope. Chimney stack raised by 500mm. Extension to rear first floor.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### 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.

### Preliminary Matters

3. For the purposes of the appeal decision banner heading, I have taken the description of development from the council's decision notice as it reflects the works explained in detail on the application form in more precise and concise terms.
4. As part of their statement of case, the appellant has sought to address concerns relating to outlook of the occupiers of 17 Lanercost Road. However, with regards to living conditions, the council's reason for refusal relates solely to 'overlooking'. I have therefore defined the second main issue on this basis.

### Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
  - the character and appearance of the area; and
  - the living conditions of occupiers of 17 Lanercost Road with specific regard to privacy.

## Reasons for the Recommendation

### *Character and appearance*

6. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. It is located on Lanercost Road which is characterised by semi-detached dwellings of similar scale and design. The original design of these dwellings feature hipped roofs. Whilst there have been some interventions at roof level, including several instances of hip to gable extensions and roof lights on some of the roof slopes, there remains an overriding traditional character owing to the prevailing roof forms and materials incorporated. From my own observations, this is also the case to rear elevations where individual dwellings are predominantly of a cohesive design with consistency to their materials.
7. Both the appeal dwelling and its semi-detached neighbour at 17 Lanercost Road feature hipped roofs. While the proposed roof extension would unbalance the roof of the semi-detached pair, it would not be uncharacteristic of the street scene with nearby examples of unbalanced pairs including either side at 13/15 and 21/23 Lanercost Road, and opposite at 14/16 and 18/20 Lanercost Road. Furthermore, there several examples of rooflights on front roof slopes.
8. However, to the rear, the hip to gable extension, in combination with the box dormer and terrace would have a top-heavy appearance. This effect would be accentuated by the scale of the dormer, which would extend to the flank wall contrary to the specific requirements of Policy Q11 of the Lambeth local Plan (2021) (LP). Additionally, the recessed design of the terrace alongside the dormer, together with the extensive glazing and the use of uncharacteristic timber cladding at roof level, would further contribute to the visual discord. Consequently, the disjointed and overwhelming appearance of the proposals to the rear elevation would appear incongruous amongst the more cohesive building forms and prevailing traditional qualities of the local vernacular.
9. I accept that there are some limited examples of large rear dormers on other dwellings on Lanercost Road. However, from the evidence before me and my observations on site, the rear elevations of other dwellings are not of the same as the overall unsympathetic composition before me. Therefore, they do not justify the site-specific harm identified.
10. The appellant suggests that they would be willing to substitute the timber cladding on the proposed dormer to tile-hung cladding to match the existing roof. However, a condition requiring this would contradict the specific details in respect of materials on the drawing. Moreover, the profile of the roof level development including its glazed elements would still portray a top-heavy appearance.
11. Therefore, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposed development would conflict with Policies Q5, Q8 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2021) (LP) which among other things, requires that development responds to the positive aspects of the locality in terms of built form including roofscapes, is of appropriate design, materials and detailing and that extensions, including dormers, are subordinate to the host dwelling and that development which unacceptably dominates the host building will not be permitted.

### *Living conditions*

12. At 17 Lanercost Road (No 17), there is a glass-roofed conservatory positioned next to the shared boundary with the appeal dwelling. I acknowledge that there is already some overlooking of the conservatory from the first-floor windows of the appeal dwelling. Moreover, as indicated by the appellant, the first floor and rear dormer windows at No 17 overlook the garden of the appeal dwelling. However, the open nature of the terrace in the roof space and the ability for people to sit out for extended periods would result in a greater presence and perception of overlooking for occupiers of No 17. Consequently, the proposal would be more intrusive than the present relationships, resulting in an unacceptable reduction in privacy for occupiers of No 17.
13. The appellant suggests that they would be willing to add a 1.7m high obscure glazed privacy screen to the side of the terrace next to No 17. However, a plan showing this has not been provided and I am also concerned that this would further add to the disjointed mix of architectural components at roof level and the variety of materials on the rear elevation. Therefore, a condition requiring such a screen would not overcome my concerns.
14. The proposed development would therefore harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 17 Lanercost Road with particular regard to privacy. In that regard, it would conflict with Policy Q2 of the LP requires that development avoids unacceptable levels of overlooking.

### **Other Matter**

15. The level of engagement between the Council and the appellant during the planning application stage is not a matter for my assessment and does not justify the harm identified under the main issues.

### **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 dismissed.

*K Hole*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

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

*M Russell*

INSPECTOR