



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2025

by C Harding BA (Hons) PGCert PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/25/3367683

75 Knatchbull Road, Lambeth, London SE5 9QU

- 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 Kirstan Butler on behalf of Phoenix Futures against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 24/03863/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the use of the property as a single dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change of use from a Large HMO (Class C4) to a single dwelling together with the removal of a side door and provision of cycle storage at 75 Knatchbull Road, Lambeth, London SE5 9QU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/03863/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, 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; EX-03-100; EX-03-101; EX-03-102; EX-03-103; EX-02-099; :EX-02-100; EX-02-101; EX-02-102; PL-03-100; PL-03-101; PL-03-102; PL-03-103; PR-02-099; PR-02-100; PR-02-101; PR-02-102; PL-00-001; Location Plan
 - 3) All new external and finishes and works of making good of the retained fabric, shall match the relevant existing parts of the development with respect to materials, colour, texture, profile and finished and appearance, except where indicated otherwise on the approved drawings and documents.
 - 4) Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, full details of the provision for cycle parking, including a timetable for implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be built in accordance with the approved details and timetable, and retained thereafter.
 - 5) Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, full details of the waste/recycling storage arrangements including a timetable for implementation, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be built in accordance with the approved details and timetable, and retained thereafter.

- 6) The dwelling hereby approved shall be designed to ensure that the internal water consumption does not exceed a maximum of 105 litres per person per day.

Preliminary Matters

2. In my decision I have used the description of the development set out on the Council's decision notice and the appeal form, as this more completely describes the development.
3. The appellant has provided a planning obligation in the form of a unilateral undertaking ('the UU'), which states that the proposal would be occupied only on the basis that no more than one resident's parking permit would be available to occupiers of the dwelling, and that membership of a car club and a cycle hire scheme would be provided. I will return to this below.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the availability of on-street parking and highway congestion.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a large building located at a corner site in an area where residential properties are prevalent. It is located within a Controlled Parking Zone ('CPZ'), in a location which has a Public Transport Access Level (PTAL) rating of 2, indicating only a "fair" access to public transport. Although it has been vacant for around a year, I understand that the property was most recently occupied as a large House in Multiple Occupation providing accommodation for up to 9 residents.
6. The proposal would not provide any off-street parking. This would align with the maximum parking standards within London Plan ('LP') Policy T6 and Lambeth Local Plan ('LLP') Policy T6. Instead, the proposal would be reliant on on-street parking within the CPZ.
7. The provided car parking stress assessment concludes that overnight demand for parking within the CPZ is not excessively high, with no instances of illegal parking being observed, and in most cases, spaces remaining available. The appellant's position is that parking demand did not exceed 55% at the time of both of surveys, and this has not been disputed by the Council. The fact that the property lies within a CPZ does not mean that the findings of the parking stress assessment are not relevant. Furthermore, while also only a snapshot in time, at the time of my visit in the early afternoon, demand for on-street parking within the CPZ appeared to be low.
8. There is no other evidence before me which would indicate that the conclusions or methodology of the parking stress assessment are unreasonable, or that on-street parking in the area is commonly oversubscribed. However, I am also mindful that without restriction, that a five-bedroom house could give rise to demand for multiple car parking spaces, particularly in the context of a PTAL 2 rating.
9. With no substantive evidence before me in relation to the likely level of parking demand that a five-bedroom dwelling in a PTAL 2 area would be likely to generate, I cannot be certain that unrestricted parking would not impose unacceptable pressure upon available parking with the CPZ. However, as the provided UU would

restrict future occupiers of the proposal to a single parking permit within the CPZ, this would limit the additional demand.

10. Overall, therefore, despite the appeal property being located within a CPZ, the evidence and UU which are before me indicate that the level of on-street parking demand which would be associated with the proposal would not be decisive in terms of parking availability or highway congestion.
11. I therefore find that the proposal would not result in harm to the availability of on-street parking or result in highway congestion. Nevertheless, it would fail to accord with LLP Policies T1 and T6, as well as LP Policies T4, and T6 which together, and among other factors seek to promote sustainable modes of travel, reduce dependency on the private car, and state that new development within CPZs should be car-free.
12. I have, however, not found conflict in relation to LLP Policies T3 and D4, and LP Policies T5 and DF1 in relation to this main issue, as these policies relate to cycle parking and planning obligations, and I address them below.

Planning Obligation

13. Car club and cycle scheme membership are explicit requirements of LLP Policies T6 and T3 respectively. Both elements serve to promote sustainable modes of transport in line with LLP Policy T1, as well as LP Policies T4 and T5, and would serve to mitigate the appeal site's relatively low level of access to public transport. I am therefore satisfied that these obligations would be necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. They would accord with the provisions of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and policy tests within the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'), as well as LLP Policy D4 and LP Policy DF1. As such, I have taken these obligations into account.
14. While I have found that the proposal would not lead to harm to the availability of on-street parking or highway congestion, I have done so on the basis that the proposal would only result in a single additional vehicle being added to the demand for permit parking within the CPZ. I therefore consider that the obligation within the UU to restrict the number of parking permits available to future occupiers would also meet the relevant tests within the Regulations, and I have also taken account of it in reaching my decision.

Other Matters

15. The appeal property lies within the Minet Estate Conservation Area, which, insofar as is relevant to this appeal, derives its significance from the consistency of the age of the buildings within it and the harmony of various rich architectural styles.
16. No party has indicated that the proposal would lead to harm to the significance of the CA, and given the proposal relates to the use of the property, rather than any significant external alterations, I have no reason to conclude any differently. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.

Conditions

17. I have attached conditions [1] and [2] in relation to the time limit for the implementation of the permission, and adherence with the specified plans in the interests of clarity. Conditions [3] and [5] relating to external materials and provision of bin storage are necessary in the interests of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. Cycle storage details required by Condition [4] are necessary in order to promote sustainable modes of travel. Condition [6] is necessary to restrict internal water consumption in the interests of climate change.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, I find that although the proposal would not result in harm through availability of on-street parking or highway congestion, it would nevertheless conflict with the development plan as a whole. However, while the benefits of the appeal proposal would be limited due to its small scale, it would nonetheless represent an efficient use of previously developed land, would deliver a family home for which the Council acknowledges that there is an identified priority need within Lambeth, and would secure the re-use of a building within the CA that has been vacant for a period of time.
19. Taken collectively, the benefits of the scheme would outweigh the conflict with the development plan. As material considerations indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached in this instance, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Harding

INSPECTOR