

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2016

by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/16/3155489

48 Odger Street, London SW11 5AF

- 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 & Mrs J Webb against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2016/1528, dated 5 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of rear single storey extension, existing conservatory to be demolished.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear single storey extension, and existing conservatory to be demolished at 48 Odger Street, London SW11 5AF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2016/1528, dated 5 April 2016, 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: Location plan, 15/180-01 and 15/180-02.
 - 3) No development shall commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Latchmere Estate Conservation Area (LECA).

Reasons

3. The LECA covers a small area, strongly characterised by the uniformity of the design of the small terraced dwellings, which lends the street scenes an attractive, ordered and distinctive appearance. This uniformity is also manifest in the small size of the rear gardens. The gardens in the vicinity of the site are mostly undeveloped, though there is a conservatory at the site and a rear extension at the adjacent property at No 50.
-

4. The proposal would replace the existing conservatory with a slightly deeper, higher and wider brick built extension. The small rear garden of the property would comfortably be able to accommodate the extension and would allow the majority of the garden to remain undeveloped.
5. The Council comments that previous extensions to properties within the LECA have been restricted to depths of 3 or 3.1 metres, though this is not specified in any policy or guidance. They calculate the proposal would be 3.45m deep, though when measured from the part of the rear elevation alongside the development, the extension would project by around 3 metres. The gardens in the vicinity are uniformly small, however I do not consider the depth of the extension would, in this case, result in the development overdominating the host property or the garden.
6. The small scale of the extension would also relate well to the modest proportions of the original dwelling, and would not disrupt the vertical emphasis of the host building and its windows. With the use of matching materials in the external surfaces of the extension, it would integrate well with the host building.
7. The rear garden is bounded by fences of around two metres in height, as are the rear gardens of other neighbouring properties, which results in a sense of openness across the nearby gardens. However the existing conservatory at the appeal site does not detract from this open character and, due to the modest increase in size, the proposal would not have a materially greater impact on this character than that which exists presently.
8. Consequently the extension would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It would therefore accord with Policy DMS1 of the Development Management Policies Document (DMPD) which requires that the scale, massing and appearance of development is of high quality, Policy DMH5 of the DMPD which requires the same with particular reference to extensions, and Policy DMS2 of the DMPD which requires proposals to conserve the significance, appearance and character of conservation areas. It would also comply with the Council's Housing SPD which gives advice on the design of residential development and the Latchmere Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy which gives specific advice for development in the LECA.

Conditions

9. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council against the requirements of the Planning Practice Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework'). Where necessary and in the interests of clarity and precision, I have altered the conditions to better reflect this guidance.
10. In accordance with the requirements of the Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework I have imposed the standard condition relating to the commencement of development, a condition specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty, and also a condition in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the conservation area.
11. Condition 3 requires compliance prior to the commencement of development so as to ensure the development would be acceptable. I have excluded from this condition the requirement for plans to be submitted at 1:50 scale, as the

approved plans are already at this scale and show the development in sufficient detail.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR