
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2016

by D Boffin BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI Dip Bldg Cons (RICS) IHBC

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

Decision date: 29 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/16/3159725

11 Malbrook Road, London SW15 6UH

- 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 Ms Jackie Jones-Parry against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2016/3536, dated 13 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is to construct a new side extension at first floor above the existing garage extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the West Putney Conservation Area (WPCA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site is cited as being located in character area B, Lower Shott, in the West Putney Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAM). From the details available to me I consider that the significance of the WPCA is largely drawn from the suburban housing that it contains together with its use of materials, pattern of development and the relationship of buildings to the spaces around them.
4. I note that guidance in the Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that *"The biggest issue with two storey side extensions is that they can fill important gaps between housesThis is especially important in some parts of conservation areas where the character is defined as much by the spaces between the buildings as it is by the buildings themselves. In situations like this two storey extensions at the side of a house may be resisted."*¹
5. This part of WPCA is characterised by large, detached houses in generous, mature landscaped plots and the distances between the houses contributes a significant, attractive sense of spaciousness to the area. I note that a number of dwellings, including the host building, have been extended but I do not consider that these additions, have completely changed or redefined the overall significance of this area. The CAAM states that *"Side extensions are not encouraged as they interrupt the architect's original intention to give quality to*

¹ Paragraph 4.17 of the SPD

*the street by creating spaciousness between the houses.*² Whilst I acknowledge that, from the evidence before me, the architect's original intention is not known I have identified that the sense of spaciousness is an important characteristic and part of the significance of WPCA.

6. The proposal would involve a first floor extension above an existing single storey structure and the side of the extension would be in close proximity to the boundary with 13 Malbrook Road (No 13). I acknowledge that the proposed eaves level and overall height of the extension would be similar to the existing 2-storey extension at No 11 and below that of the 2-storey extension at No 13. Furthermore, the extension would be constructed of appropriate materials and it would be set back from the front elevation of No 11.
7. However, the proposal would visually fill the majority of the remaining gap, at first floor level, between the appeal dwelling and No 13. This existing gap is an important element of the streetscene, as it contributes to and reinforces the spacious character of this part of WPCA. Furthermore, the existing space provides views of the mature trees in the background, which are a positive feature of WPCA.³ Whilst some views would be retained the loss of the gap and views through at first floor level would mean that the spaciousness that forms an important part of the character and appearance of WPCA would be significantly eroded by the proposal.
8. In the language of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the harm the proposal would cause to the significance of WPCA would be less than substantial as the impact of the proposal would be relatively localised. Paragraph 134 of the Framework states that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case there would be no public benefits to outweigh this harm. I have attached considerable importance and weight to the desirability of avoiding any such harmful effect in accordance with section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would fail to preserve the character or appearance of WPCA, thereby causing less than substantial harm to its significance as a designated heritage asset. In the absence of any public benefits to outweigh this harm it is therefore contrary to Policies DMS1, DMS2 and DMH5 of the Development Management Policies Document. These policies, amongst other things, seek high quality, sustainable urban design and well-designed extensions that conserve and where appropriate enhance the character and appearance of heritage assets. The proposal would also not comply with the Framework and guidance in the CAAM and the SPD.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D. Boffin

INSPECTOR

² Paragraph 2.12 of the CAAM

³ Paragraphs 6.57 and 6.58 of the CAAM