



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 April 2026

Decision by D Ellis MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 June 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/25/3374552

14 & 15 Waldo Close, Clapham, London SW4 9EY

- 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 Bruno Almeida Santos against the decision of Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref is 25/01298/FUL.
 - The development proposed is rear extension to number 14 Waldo Close and new storey above garage of both number 14 and 15 Waldo Close to provide an ensuite bedroom for each property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 13 and 14 Waldo Close with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The street has a mix of two- and three-storey terraced properties. Both 14 Waldo Close and 15 Waldo Close are three-storey end-of-terrace dwellings. The properties in Waldo Close and Timothy Close are built to a common design and matching exterior materials, which gives an attractive and cohesive appearance and rhythm which makes a strong positive contribution to the character of the street.
 4. The proposed additional storey above the existing garages would accord with the design and materials of the street scene, and the external staircase would be lightweight in appearance. However, as the garages are attached to the side of No 14 and are built up to the rear boundary, the additional storey would add considerable scale and massing to the side of No 14. Furthermore, the proposed single-storey rear extension would take up a large part of the rear garden, and only a small area of garden space would remain. For these reasons, the scale of the proposed extensions would be a dominant addition which would not respond positively to the existing dwelling at No 14. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of No 14.
-

5. I have been referred to a planning appeal at Floris Place, London¹. However, this appeal was for a loft conversion and mansard roof extension. This appeal is therefore not directly comparable to the proposal before me. Nevertheless, the Inspector found that the roof extension would be clearly subordinate to the host building, unlike the extensions proposed in the appeal before me.
6. My attention has also been drawn to other planning approvals. The approvals at 16 and 17 Waldo Close do not involve either a single-storey rear extension or a first-floor extension above a garage. 1A Elms Road involved a change of use to a dwelling with no amenity space, and there is no suggestion that any extensions were included. It is unclear whether the first-floor extension approved at 26 Elms Crescent projects the entire length of the rear garden. The other examples all involve single-storey rear extensions, however it is unknown from the evidence before me whether the remaining or adjacent garden areas were next to a two-storey building which projected along the length of the garden. As such, I am not persuaded that these examples of planning approvals are directly comparable to the appeal scheme before me, which has been determined on its own merits.
7. The proposal would therefore conflict with policy Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan 2020-2035 (LP), insofar as it requires development to have a design which positively responds to the original architecture of the host building and to not unacceptably dominate the host building.

Living conditions

8. Only a small rear garden area at No 14 would remain as a result of the proposed single-storey rear extension, and the extension above the garages would project the entire length of the rear garden. As a result, the additional height of the extension above the garages would be visually intrusive and would have a significant sense of enclosure and overbearing impact on the remaining rear garden.
9. Many of the scenarios in the appellant's overshadowing study show the amount of shadow in the rear garden of No 14 would not significantly change. However, the 9am scenarios for 21st March and 21st June show that the single-storey rear extension would be built on the part of the garden which receives the most sunlight, and that the remaining area of garden would be mostly in shadow. As a result of the significant sense of enclosure, overbearing impact and overshadowing, the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 14.
10. The rooflight in the proposed rear extension would provide adequate light to the extension and the dual-aspect of the first-floor living room would prevent any significant loss of light or sense of enclosure to that room, however this would not alter the harm identified. It is accepted that the approved development at Lambeth College² would reduce the amount of light received by the rear windows at No 14, although the main parties disagree over the severity of this. Nevertheless, even a modest loss of light from the Lambeth College development would not justify the harm identified above.
11. The three-storey rear elevation of No 14 already projects beyond the rear of 13 Waldo Close. The main parties agree that permitted development rights have been

¹ Appeal ref. APP/N5660/W/17/3176333

² Planning application ref. 22/03713/FUL

removed for the appeal site. Even if the proposed rear extension meets the size requirements for permitted development, the rear extension together with the existing projection of the rear elevation at No 14 would project a substantial distance along the boundary with No 13. The appellant states that the ground-floor rear windows at No 13 serve a kitchen and breakfast area. This is likely to be a room where people spend significant periods of time, especially as there are no other habitable rooms on the ground-floor, so it would be reasonable to consider the kitchen and breakfast area also as a habitable room. Given the modest size of the rear garden at No 13 and the proximity of the kitchen window and glazed rear door, the projection and height of the proposed rear extension would cause a significant sense of enclosure and overbearing impact to the garden and ground-floor rear windows at No 13.

12. My attention has been drawn to other scenarios and extensions in the local area. 18 Waldo Close also has a small garden however it does not have a two-storey wall projecting along one entire side of the garden. The rear elevation of No 18 projects beyond the rear of 17 Waldo Close, however No 18 is a two-storey dwelling and there is no additional single-storey rear extension along the boundary with No 17.
13. While Clapham Common is nearby for outdoor amenity, this would not alter or mitigate the sense of enclosure, overbearing impact or overshadowing identified above.
14. Overall, the proposal would significantly detract from the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 13 and 14 in respect of outlook and light. The proposal is therefore contrary to LP policy GP2, insofar as it requires development to provide adequate outlook, avoid any undue sense of enclosure, and to not have an unacceptable impact on levels of daylight and sunlight on the host building or adjoining property including their gardens.

Other matters

15. I understand that the extension would provide a more comfortable and functional environment for the appellant, however this would not outweigh the harms identified.
16. The Council did not object on the grounds of parking provision, highway safety, and environmental impact and, based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to disagree. There were also no objections from statutory consultees. However, this represents a lack of harm in these areas and as such these are neutral matters which do not weigh in favour or against the proposal.
17. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council however I am not persuaded that they would make the proposal acceptable, as they would not overcome the harms identified above.
18. I note the concerns regarding the Council's handling of the case, and in particular the lack of response to requests sent by the appellant. However, this is a matter that would need to be taken up with the Council in the first instance, and in determining the appeal I have only had regard to the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

19. I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

D Ellis

INSPECTOR