

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: 16 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/16/3159552
24 Alma Road, London SW18 1AB

- 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 Gold against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2016/3209, dated 3 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension over the 2 storey rear addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. The second is the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of the occupiers at the adjoining property with respect to outlook and degree of enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a 3 storey mid-terraced property which has a mansard providing the third storey. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, with a significant number of properties benefiting from mansard roof extensions and other rear additions.
 4. This and the other dwellings within the terrace include 2 storey outriggers with pitched roofs. These prominent structures provide a degree of uniformity and balance between each pair of dwellings up to the mansard level. The mansards extend in many cases along the terrace across part of the outrigger but only as far as a point just behind the extent of the party wall and in some cases the chimneys.
 5. The proposal would consist of a roof extension at second floor level to provide an additional bedroom. The extended party wall would be finished in stock brickwork and the remainder slated to match the existing mansard.
 6. The proposal would extend across much of the width and depth of the outrigger and would result in the loss of most of its sloping roof. The extension would
-

have a vertical side rather than the gentle slope of the existing mansard additions at this and other nearby properties. The result would be a large flat roofed box-like structure. This would not replicate the roof extensions in the immediate vicinity as suggested by the appellant and although not prominently viewed from open public areas it would be easily seen from neighbouring properties. Although it would be set down from the overall roof level, it would be high up and the hanging with slate would not be sufficient to make the structure blend with the overall building.

7. The extension would not blend-in and would dominate the rear view of the building. The loss of symmetry across the back of this and the adjoining part of the outrigger would be detrimental to the existing visual balance. A large extension across the roof of a similar outrigger within nearby Ferndale Road is referred to by the appellant. However this has not altered the character of dwellings near the site and does not justify the harm that would be caused by this proposal. It does not change my consideration of the merits of this case.
8. In relation to the first main issue, the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. This would not comply with Policies DMS1 and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan¹.

Living conditions

9. The occupants of the adjoining dwellings at Nos 22 and 26 Alma Road have not objected to the proposal. However the proposed roof extension would be close to the window within the adjoining mansard roof at No 22. The increased length of the extended party wall would interfere with the outlook to one side of that window which would bring about an increased sense of enclosure.
10. The extension would be a substantial distance from the dwelling at No 26 and those to the rear within Dempster Road. Those residents would not be substantially affected by the proposal.
11. The Council has provided me with a copy of the Housing Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2015 (SPD). This advises against extensions over the full length of back additions due to the potential impacts to neighbouring amenities. The appellant refers to the draft review of that document. That contains similar advice. Neither document encourages this extent of rear extension proposed in this case.
12. In relation to the second main issue, the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the living conditions of the occupiers at the adjoining property at No 22 with respect to loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure. This would not comply with LP Policies DMS1 and DMH5 or the SPD.

Conclusion

13. 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