The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2016

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/16/3159380
46 Bolingbroke Grove, London SW11 6HF

- 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 Louise Thurlow against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
- The application Ref 2016/3738, dated 24 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2016.
- The development proposed is a first floor rear extension (enlarged version of previously approved extension).

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. Whether the proposed extension would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site includes a semi-detached dwelling which fronts onto Bolingbroke Grove which runs alongside Wandsworth Common. It is within a line of similar attractive traditional dwellings but also adjoins the modern 3 storey flat roofed block of flats at Pembury Court which is also within the CA. The dwellings to the rear within Honeywell Road also have a traditional appearance and are within the CA. The more modern dwellings within Cobham Close to the rear are outside of the CA. There is some variety therefore to the design of buildings nearby within and just outside of the CA.

4. The dwelling at the moment includes single storey elements such as a large gabled ended conservatory that have been added to the original form of the dwelling which has a traditional 3 storey return. The adjoining dwelling at No 45 also has a ground floor extension and a 3 storey return. The pair of dwellings retain a good degree of symmetry on the upper floors which are overlooked from the upper windows of neighbouring properties. Public views into the site are limited but occupants of those adjoining properties would see the upper levels of the building. From the site, I could see the upper floors of neighbouring properties including some of the large roof alterations.

5. The proposal would involve adding a flat roof extension out to the same depth as the existing flat roof addition which at the moment is set down well below

first floor window level. The extension would protrude significantly beyond the rear wall of the high return. This would be noticeable from adjoining properties above the gable of the existing conservatory. It would appear cumbersome on the rear of the dwelling not respecting the simple but traditional details on the existing building.

6. Although some other properties have had different forms of rear additions I have to consider this proposal on its own merits. It would result in a further form of flat roof in a high position that would be incongruous with the existing dwelling and generally within the area. Public views would be limited but the extension would not be completely screened from outside views. The simple charm of the upper floors of the dwelling contributes to the character and appearance of the CA and that contribution would be diminished.

7. I have not been provided with copies of the previously approved plans for an extension in the same position. It is clarified within the representations that the current proposal would be 1½m deeper than what has already been approved. It seems clear therefore that the alternative scheme would have less of an impact than the current proposal.

8. In relation to the main issue, the proposed extension would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This would not comply with Policies DMS1, DMS2 or DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan[1] or the Council's Housing Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2015.

Other Matters

9. The proposal would not be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring dwellings which is therefore a neutral matter. It would also create more space within the dwelling itself but I have no evidence to indicate that this is anything more than a limited personal benefit to the appellant.

10. The extension would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA. This harm would not be outweighed by any public benefits therefore the proposal would not meet the requirements of paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andy Harwood

INSPECTOR

[1] Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document, adopted March 2016