

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2016

by Kevin Gleeson BA MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/16/3163601

61 Victoria Drive, London SW19 6HN

- 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 Marco Conti against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2016/4665 dated 4 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of the second floor and three-storey rear extension with internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene within Victoria Drive; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of the host property with particular reference to the provision of private amenity space.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached house which adjoins the external staircase to the apartment at 59 Victoria Drive and a dental practice at 57 Victoria Drive. Neighbouring properties to the north and south are three storeys high although those to the south have the upper floor set back from the frontage. The proposal would create an additional floor of accommodation extending across the full width of the existing property. Within the rear garden a part single and part three storey extension is proposed with the single storey element extending to the rear boundary.
 4. The proposed additional storey would be set back from the frontage through the creation of a balcony whilst a mono-pitched roof on either side of the balcony door would help to reduce the overall bulk of the development. However, the semi-dormer roof form is not in keeping with neighbouring properties which are predominantly flat roof forms.
-

5. The rear extension would be large in the context of the scale of the existing property and would not be subservient to it. It would therefore be over-dominant and detract from the original form of the property.
6. The appeal property is lower than the three storey buildings on either side but in terms of overall height the proposed additional storey would not exceed the height of the neighbouring properties. The existing property sits forward of the buildings on either side although further to the south the building line is stepped forward. The existing building is an infill development within a narrow plot but the additional storey would appear bulky in spite of the proposed set back. The additional storey would still sit considerably further forward than the neighbouring properties, appearing out of place within the streetscene in a way in which the existing lower building does not.
7. As a consequence the proposal would appear visually intrusive causing harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider streetscene contrary to Policies DMS1 and DMH5 of the London Borough of Wandsworth Local Plan – Development Management Policies Document (DMPD), 2016. Among other things these policies require the scale, massing and appearance of new development to provide a high quality design which contributes positively to local character and that extensions do not harm either the street scene or the building's appearance. By virtue of the scale of development to the rear, the proposal would also be contrary to the advice of Policy DMH5 which states that rear extensions should be subservient to the original house and its setting.

Living Conditions

8. The proposed development would result in a considerable reduction in the existing rear garden area to less than 10sq.m. This is significantly below the area of 15sq.m recommended in Policy DMH7 of the DMPD. It would also result in the depth of the rear garden being reduced. The loss of private amenity space on site would render the remaining space less usable and desirable which would be contrary to Policy DMH5 of the DMPD which seeks to ensure that a substantial depth of the original rear garden remains free of buildings.

Other Matters

9. I note that the appellant wishes to extend the family home to meet the needs of a growing family. However, I have to consider this case on the individual planning merits having regard to the development plan and other material considerations including the specific circumstances of this particular site and its immediate surroundings. These other considerations do not clearly outweigh the harm which I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

Kevin Gleeson

INSPECTOR