
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 August 2016

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/16/3150224

15 Festing Road, London, SW15 1LW

- 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 Mrs Lucinda McKee against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2015/7486, dated 23 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 17 February 2016.
 - The development proposed is loft extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft extension at 15 Festing Road, London, SW15 1LW in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2015/7486, dated 23 December 2015, 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 the following approved plans: 1:1250 location plan and 4571 plans and elevations.
 - 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.
 - 4) The side facing window in the approved roof extension shall be obscure-glazed and non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7m above the floor of the room in which the window is installed, and shall be maintained as such in the future, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Main issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and on the living condition of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

4. 15 Festing Road is a two storey mid terrace house. In common with other houses in the terrace it has one of a pair of two storey outriggers with pitched roofs meeting in a ridge along the common boundary. No. 15 has a single

storey wraparound rear extension and dormer windows on the main roof and the outrigger.

5. Relevant policies in this case include DMS1 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document 2016 (the DMPD) which contains general principles including that development should be of a scale, massing and appearance which provide a high quality of design and that it should not harm the amenities of nearby occupiers. Policy DMH5 sets out criteria for residential alterations and extensions and further detailed guidance on this topic is provided in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Housing* 2015. The latter advises that extensions over existing back additions should only cover 50% of the addition.
6. The proposed roof extension would extend along most of the length of the existing outrigger in a mansard style design with a dormer window facing the side boundary and another facing the rear garden. It would appear as a substantial addition to the rear of the house and the proposed materials would contrast with the brickwork of the main house, but reflect those of the existing addition to the outrigger. However, it would only be visible from the rear windows of a limited number of surrounding properties, partly because of the screening provided by trees and shrubs in the garden, and it would not be visible at all from the street.
7. I saw during my visit that there are numerous other examples of similar extensions very nearby in Festing Road and in Rotherwood Road to the rear. Although some of these may have been built under permitted development rights or before the current policies were introduced, I consider that they are now a significant common feature of the local environment. In this instance, I find that any adverse effect of an extension which is not wholly consistent with the guidance in the SPD because of its length, is not so great as to warrant dismissing the appeal, particularly as the guidance in the latter focuses more on the potential harmful impact on neighbours than on appearance unless the property is on a corner or otherwise visible from the street.
8. The proposal would provide additional family accommodation and it would not be visible from public viewpoints. I conclude that it would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and would not be contrary to DMPD policies DMS1 and DMH5 in this respect.
9. In my opinion, the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the outlook of neighbouring residents and nor would it result in excessive overshadowing or loss of light. The increase of approximately 2m compared with the existing extension would have little additional impact on the occupiers of No. 17 beyond that already arising from the outrigger itself and the existing extension. No. 13 lies to the south and would not be overshadowed by the addition and the privacy of the occupiers can be secured by a condition requiring obscure glass.
10. I conclude that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents and in this respect it would not be contrary to policy DMS1.
11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

12.I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. The condition relating to the materials to be used is necessary and reasonable in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development and that relating to the window is necessary and reasonable to safeguard the privacy of neighbours.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR