



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 2 October 2025

by **H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th October 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/N5660/W/25/3366331

128 Clapham Manor Street, Lambeth, London SW4 6ED

- 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 Philip Kwan (PK & Partners Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
- The application Ref is 25/00094/FUL.
- The development proposed is a 1st floor rear extension for storage.

Appeal B Ref: APP/N5660/W/25/3369342

128 Clapham Manor Street, Lambeth, London SW4 6ED

- 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 Philip Kwan (PK & Partners Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
- The application Ref is 25/01234/FUL.
- The development proposed is a 1st floor extension for storage.

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As set out above, two appeals are before me. Each seek planning permission for a first-floor extension at the rear of 128 Clapham Manor Street (No 128), but the renditions of the design of the extensions differ. Since the character of the developments are similar, in the interests of avoiding duplication, it was appropriate to issue a single decision document covering the separate appeal schemes.
4. The plans before me in respect of both appeal developments contain some discrepancies. In respect of Appeal A, a proposed north-west side elevation¹ depicts an extension with a hipped-roof, and a shorter projection than other submitted plans. Informed by the comments I have received on the matter from the appeal parties, it is clear that this proposed elevation is incorrectly drawn, that the extension the subject of Appeal A is proposed to be of a greater projection, and that it is proposed to be served by a flat roof.
5. Unlike Appeal A, the extension the subject of Appeal B is proposed to be served by a hipped roof. Again, however, the projection of the extension is incorrectly

¹ Proposed NW Side Elevation shown on plan 2436-PKP-08 Rev A

depicted by the proposed north-west side elevation². Therefore, for the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeals on the basis that the proposed north-west side elevations submitted on both appeals are erroneous, and that the remaining plans correctly depict the developments proposed.

6. A flat-roofed, first-floor rear extension has been constructed on site. Although the site visit I conducted enabled me to assess the appeal site and its surroundings thoroughly, sufficient to inform my decisions on the appeals, from the vantage points I had, I was unable to ascertain whether every element of the constructed extension matched the proposed plans for the flat-roofed extension the subject of Appeal A. Consequently, I have treated the flat-roofed extension the subject of Appeal A as a proposal, rather than on a retrospective basis, and this is reflected in my use of tense. Since Appeal B seeks planning permission for an extension with a hipped roof, and the extension which has been built has a flat roof, I have also treated Appeal B as a proposed development.
7. The appeal site is situated within the Rectory Grove Conservation Area. As a result, in making my decisions, I have had special regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issue

8. The main issue in respect of both appeals is:
 - Whether the proposed developments would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Rectory Grove Conservation Area.

Reasons

9. The Rectory Grove Conservation Area (the CA) has distinct character areas. In the north of the CA, around the streets of Rectory Grove and Larkhall Rise, a more informal built pattern of development prevails. The many residential properties in this part of the CA provide it with a suburban character, whilst its many trees and St Paul's Churchyard provide it with a verdant character. The character and appearance of the CA differs where Clapham Manor Street runs through it. Here, Clapham Manor Street's wide and straight nature, and lining by buildings with a generally consistent set-back, provides the CA with much more formality.
10. Although there are examples to the contrary, with some contemporary additions, many buildings within the CA are traditionally designed and utilise traditional building materials, and this is the prevailing character which is exuded. Yellow, brown and red bricks, and render and stucco, are common materials and finishes. A variety of distinctive roof forms are also exhibited within the CA. For these reasons, the significance of the CA is principally derived from its architectural interest but also from its historic interest since it provides evidence of the development of suburban London.
11. Located within a terrace fronting Clapham Manor Street, No 128 exemplifies the formal development pattern that partly defines this section of the CA. Its traditional brickwork and stucco detailing are characteristic of the architectural style found within the CA. Featuring both parapet sections and a sequence of hipped roofs, No 128 has a distinctive roofscape as many other properties within the CA do.

² Proposed NW Side Elevation shown on plan 2436-PKP-08 Rev B

Additionally, its rear returns create a stepped rear building line which adds to its architectural interest. No 128's traditional design and material composition are therefore reflective of the CA as a whole, and it makes a positive contribution to the CA's significance as a result.

12. Upon completion of either proposal, a new section of rear elevation at first-floor level would align with No 128's furthest rear projection. As a result, the stepped rear building line of No 128 would be diminished, undermining this aspect of the property's architectural interest.
13. Proposed to be positioned amongst No 128's assortment of hipped-roofs, the flat-roof which would serve the extension the subject of Appeal A would form an incongruous addition to the roofscape. It would be unsympathetic to, and harmfully detract from, No 128's distinctive roofscape.
14. No 128 is positioned on a corner, and its rear elevation and rear roofscape is readily appreciable in views from Cresset Street. Consequently, the harmful effects which would be wrought by the extent of both extensions' projections, and by the Appeal A proposal's flat-roof, would be prominent. As a result, both proposals would respond poorly to No 128's distinctiveness and architectural interest, and they would each harm the CA as a whole, failing to preserve its character and appearance.
15. Using the language of the National Planning Policy Framework, the harm to the CA would be less than substantial, and given the scale of the developments proposed, and the proportion of the CA which would be affected, the level of harm to the CA as a whole would be low. However, harm would nevertheless arise from each proposal and, having regard to the relevant statutory duty I set out earlier, this is a matter of considerable importance and weight in my decisions. The extensions proposed would be likely to improve the accommodation within the property, but this would not provide a public benefit of much significance and, overall, no public benefits have been presented to me, nor that I can think apply, which would be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified to the CA.
16. Therefore, for the reasons I have set out, each of the proposed developments would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. As a result, the proposals the subject of both Appeal A and Appeal B conflict with Policies Q5, Q8, Q11 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035. Altogether, in summary and amongst other matters, these Policies seek to ensure that developments preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas, sustain and reinforce local distinctiveness, utilise a design and construction detailing which is visually attractive and, in respect of extensions, require designs to positively respond to the host property. I also find that both of the proposed developments conflict with Policy HC1 of the London Plan which seeks to ensure that developments conserve, and avoid harm to, the significance of heritage assets.

Other Matters

17. I note that planning permission has been granted before for a first-floor extension at No 128³. I have limited evidence before me in its regard, including no plans and, consequently, I am unable to accurately compare that development to those which

³ Planning permission reference 21/02031/FUL

are for my determination. However, the evidence I do have suggests to me that the previously approved extension was of a different scale, with a shorter projection. On this basis, the previously approved extension would be unlikely to result in effects comparable to the appeal schemes nor cause the same harm. Furthermore, I cannot be certain that the planning permission previously granted remains extant. For these reasons, the previously approved first-floor extension does not constitute a fallback position of meaningful weight in my decisions.

18. It may be, in respect of some other planning considerations, that the proposed developments would not result in harmful effects. This may include the effects which would be brought about upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, an absence of harm is a neutral factor in my decisions, and it does not outweigh the harm that I have identified in my main issue.

Conclusion

19. The proposed developments the subject of Appeal A and Appeal B each conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate that decisions other than ones in accordance with the development plan should be made. Therefore, I conclude that Appeal A and Appeal B should each be dismissed.

H Jones

INSPECTOR