

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2016

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/16/3163417
23 Enmore Road, London SW15 6LL

- 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 Desmond Howard against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2016/2777, dated 25 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of new front and side dormer windows to main front roof, new raised wall and flat roof to a section of the side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of new front and side dormer windows to main front roof, new raised wall and flat roof to a section of the side elevation at 23 Enmore Road, London SW15 6LL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2016/2777, dated 25 May 2016, 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: Refs 001, 002, 003 and 004 Rev P00.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 Enmore Road with particular regard to outlook and sense of enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house with a double height bay and gable at the front in a street of similar properties within the West Putney Conservation Area (CA). The CA is predominantly residential in character. In the vicinity of the site, buildings are generally Edwardian in style and evenly spaced apart in a grid street layout, which creates a well-mannered
-

streetscape. I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA, as required by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

4. The proposal is to raise the height of part of the existing side return wall to the rear projection of No 23 and to alter a section of its pitched roof to include a flat roof. For brevity, I shall refer to this element of the appeal scheme as the rear extension. A new dormer extension would also be placed onto each of the front and side roof slopes to the main house to replace the existing roof lights.
5. The proposed rear extension would add to the scale and mass of the rear projection with the new flat roof visually accentuating its bulk. Nevertheless, the top of the raised sidewall would remain comfortably below the ridge of the main dwelling and the essential shape of the host building would remain with the new built form in place. From the back garden of No 23, the rear projection of the finished building would continue to appear clearly subordinate in scale, height and form to the original house beyond it. The same impression would be gained in glimpses of the upper raised wall from the side and rear of the adjacent property, which is 21 Enmore Road. Little of the rear extension would be seen from Enmore Road. The external materials would match the existing dwelling and the proposed openings would be in keeping with the style and appearance of the host building. For all of these reasons, the new rear extension would be a sympathetic addition and the character and appearance of the existing dwelling would be maintained with the new built form in place.
6. The Council appears to raise no objection, in principle, to the new flat roof front and side dormers, although it does have some detailed design concerns with regard to the use of materials and fascia panels. The application forms make clear that each new dormer would be clad in lead and include timber-framed windows, which would reflect the architectural style of the house. Each of the dormers would be modest in size and simple in design with fascia elements that would be well proportioned and would not appear over pronounced. From what I saw, dormers are a prominent feature of many properties in the CA and a familiar feature of several local street scenes within it. Consequently, these elements of the appeal scheme would not be uncharacteristic additions.
7. Taken as a whole, the proposal would be of a high standard of design that would be in keeping with the qualities and character of a semi-detached house of relatively distinguished appearance. There would be no discernable effect on the qualities of the street scene or the suburban residential feel to the CA. As a result, the character and appearance of the CA would be preserved.

Living conditions

8. Part of the new rear extension would be visible from the side windows of No 21 and its single storey side addition, which includes a glazed roof. In these views, the wall to the side return of No 23 would be taller and appear more substantive than the existing wall. Nevertheless, the side windows of No 21 already face the side elevation of No 23 at reasonably close range and so there would be little change to this outlook. Views from the ground floor side projection of No 21 would be likely to be at a tight upward angle and the main direction of outlook from this part of the house across the rear garden would not be affected.

9. The proposal would be visible from the side and rear of No 21. However, its scale, depth, height and position would not cause it to overly dominate outlook or overbear on the occupiers of this adjacent property nor would it unduly heighten a sense of enclosure for them.

Conclusion on the main issues

10. On the main issues, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the local area or the living conditions of the occupiers of No 21. Accordingly, there is no material conflict with Policies DMS 1 and DMH 5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document. These policies aim to ensure that development is well designed; is sympathetic to the style of the building; does not harm the street scene; and safeguards residential amenity.
11. The proposal would also adhere to the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework in that the proposed development would achieve a high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all occupiers of land and buildings. It would also conserve the CA, as a designated heritage asset, in a manner appropriate to its significance.

Other matters

12. In reaching this conclusion, I have taken into account the various examples of roof level developments in the local area to which the appellant has referred. Nevertheless, I assessed the proposal on its own merits, as I am required to do, and find it to be acceptable for the reasons given.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings and to require that the development be carried out in accordance with them as this provides certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is attached to require that the external materials match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR