



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2025

by **SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/25/3370793

24 and 26 Sunset Road, Lambeth, London SE5 8EA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Stavros and Ciara Gregoriou and Mr and Mrs Gregoriou & Guy Scurfield against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 25/01619/FUL.
 - The development proposed is Erection of a front roof extension across 24 and 26 Sunset Road introducing an additional roof ridge; removal of chimney stack at No 24; relocation of existing front rooflight at No 26 and insertion of a roof level side window at No 26 Sunset Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Erection of a front roof extension across 24 and 26 Sunset Road introducing an additional roof ridge; removal of chimney stack at No 24; relocation of existing front rooflight at No 26 and insertion of a roof level side window at No 26 Sunset Road at 24 and 26 Sunset Road, Lambeth, London SE5 8EA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 25/01619/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 the following approved plans: OS Map; 110 000; 160 000; 100 000; 150 000; 120 000; 130 000; 140 000; 170 000; 260 000; 250 000; 220 000; 230 000; 240 000.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have changed the address of the appeal site in the banner heading above to that used on the Decision Notice, which provides greater clarity and accuracy in referencing both properties.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the:
 - character and appearance of the host dwellings and the surrounding area;
 - living conditions of the occupiers of 28 Sunset Road (No.28), particularly in terms of daylight and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a pair of semi-detached two-storey dwellings at 24 (No.24) and 26 (No.26) Sunset Road. No. 24 is characterised by a steep hipped roof extending across the full width of the property with a side dormer addition. By contrast, No. 26 features a prominent two-storey bay-fronted feature that projects forward of No.24. As a result, despite having a level of uniformity in terms of materiality and architectural detail there is limited symmetry between the two dwellings.
5. Sunset Road is generally characterised by two-storey semi-detached dwellings set back from the road behind modest front gardens, which contribute to a sense of openness. The consistent use of materials such as brick, render, and roof tiles, along with the regular rhythm of bay-fronted projections, imparts the street with a cohesive and attractive architectural character. While variations in roof form, including the position of main ridge lines, are evident, the overall streetscape retains a sense of uniformity and visual coherence.
6. The appeal proposal seeks to construct a front roof extension extending across both dwellings, introducing a secondary ridge line set approximately 1.6 metres forward of the existing and resulting in the removal of an existing chimney. The two ridges would be connected by a flat roof containing two rooflights. The extension would sit behind the principal projecting roof features of both No. 24 and No. 26 and would be finished in materials matching the host buildings.
7. The Lambeth Design Guide Part 4 - Building Alterations, Extensions and Retrofit (2023) (the SPD) supports the principle of optimising accommodation through roof extensions, within the constraints of achieving subordination and protecting the design of the host building.
8. The proposed extension would be modest in scale and discreetly positioned behind the prominent projecting roof features that define and dominate the principal elevations and roofscape of both dwellings. Its position, form and use of matching materials would prevent any sense of dominance or visual intrusion. Although the introduction of a secondary ridge line would constitute an uncommon feature within the immediate streetscape, it would not compromise the legibility of the original roof forms nor diminish the remaining architectural coherence and symmetry of the pair. The design would read as a contextual and proportionate adaptation rather than an incongruous addition.
9. Given their setback from the street and the pronounced projecting roof features to the front of both dwellings, public views of the proposed extension would be limited. Existing mature vegetation would provide an additional degree of screening when viewed travelling east along Sunset Road during the summer months. Where visible from oblique perspectives along Sunset Road, the proposal would appear recessive and integrated within the wider roofscape. It would therefore sit comfortably within its setting, consistent with the pattern of roof form variation evident elsewhere along the street.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the host dwellings or the surrounding area. The proposal would comply with Policies Q5 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (2021)

(LLP), which seek high-quality design and to ensure the subordination of extensions. It would also comply with the design principles of the SPD, which encourages sensitive upward extensions consistent with prevailing roof forms.

Neighbours' living conditions

11. Policy Q2 of the LLP seeks to ensure that development proposals safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, including through the retention of acceptable levels of daylight and sunlight. The appellant's Design and Access Statement refers to these considerations but does not explicitly reference, or adopt, the methodology set out in the Building Research Establishment's Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (2022). Notwithstanding, given the scale of the proposal, the clear information available in respect of site layout, orientation and separation and observations on my site visit I am satisfied that, in this case, the effects can be reliably assessed.
12. The proposed roof extension would result in only a limited forward projection of the existing ridge at No. 26 and would remain well set back from the principal two-storey front projection. The established separation between Nos. 26 and 28 would be retained. Owing to the orientation of No. 28, its primary sources of daylight and sunlight are derived from its front and rear elevations rather than the flank elevation facing the appeal site where the windows do not appear to be the primary source of light to habitable rooms. Consequently, any reduction in daylight or sunlight would have a limited impact.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 28, with particular regard to daylight and sunlight. The proposal would comply with Policy Q2 of the LLP, which seeks to ensure adjoining occupiers retain acceptable levels of amenity.

Other Matter

14. A neighbouring party has raised the potential of overshadowing of No.28 and its garden. As set out above, given the modest scale and set-back position of the proposed roof extension, together with the established separation and site orientation, any additional overshadowing would be minor and short-lived. The proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in this regard.

Conditions

15. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests of paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework and advice in the Planning Practice Guidance: Use of planning conditions. In addition to the statutory time limit condition, a condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary to provide certainty. A condition relating to materials is also reasonable and necessary in the interests of character and appearance.

Conclusion

16. I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan and there are no material considerations that outweigh this finding. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

SJ Desai

INSPECTOR