
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by B Bowker Mplan MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/16/3158835

143 Lavender Hill, Wandsworth, London SW11 5QJ

- 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 Timothy Glass against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2015/6259, dated 6 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a mansard roof extension to front and rear including raising the ridge by approximately 500mm and a hip to gable side roof extension with dormer to the front. Alterations and extensions in connection with the formation of a one-bedroom flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a mansard roof extension to front and rear including raising the ridge by approximately 500mm and a hip to gable side roof extension with dormer to the front. Alterations and extensions in connection with the formation of a one-bedroom flat, at 143 Lavender Hill, Wandsworth, London SW11 5QJ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2015/6259, dated 6 November 2015, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 143LH-PL-001, 143LH-PL-002, 143LH-PL-003, 143LH-PL-004, 143LH-PL-005, 143LH-PL-006, 143LH-PL-007, 143LH-PL-008, 143LH-PL-009, 143LH-PL-010, 143LH-PL-011.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the approved development shall match those of the existing building except where indicated otherwise on the approved drawings.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development used above is taken from the decision notice and appeal form as it more accurately reflects the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end of terrace property comprising ground floor retail use with upper floor residential accommodation. No 143 Lavender Hill forms part of a wider terrace which has an unaltered symmetrical hipped roof form. Adjacent to the site is No 145 Lavender Hill which is a larger property forming part of a terrace that has a 'London Roof' design. Whilst the appeal property forms part of an attractive terrace, it is located in an area where roofs and roof extensions vary in design and appearance. Nonetheless, other unaltered roof terraces are evident in the wider area.
5. During my site visit, I observed how the proximity and scale of No 145 restricted the visibility of No 143's roof to public vantage points to the east of the site and the immediate vicinity. I also saw that despite the different roof design and raised parapet wall, the roof extensions at No 145 and 147 remain prominent in the wider street scene. The Council state that the roof extensions at Nos 145 and 147 would be unlikely to receive permission under current policy and guidance. However, this matter does not remove the presence that they have in the streetscene.
6. When viewed from vantage points to the east, the proposal would be seen in the context of the larger adjoining properties. Views of the proposal from the immediate vicinity would be mostly from the opposite side of the road where it would be viewed alongside adjoining larger properties with roof extensions. As the rear of the terrace has a varied appearance with two storey outriggers and a roof extension, the proposal would not be a particularly noticeable feature when viewed from the rear.
7. Owing to the modest scale of the dormer window, the minor increase in ridge height and the continuation of the eaves, the proposal would be inconspicuous when viewed from the above noted public vantage points. In addition, notwithstanding the symmetry of the host hipped roof terrace, I agree with the appellant that the proposal would be a subtle transition between the terraces. Moreover, taking into account the variation of roof forms both altered and unaltered in the wider area; the proposal would be a discreet addition to the streetscene.
8. The Council's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) document states that owing to their visible location, alterations to front roof slopes are rarely acceptable. The SPG also states that raising the roof ridge line is unacceptable at a terraced property where it would differ from neighbouring properties. In this context, as reasoned above, the proposal would not be a prominent feature in the wider streetscene and would be viewed alongside the larger neighbouring property No 145. Moreover, the proposal would meet the SPG's purpose requiring roof extensions to preserve the character and appearance of the house and the area generally.
9. Therefore I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building or surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal would meet the requirements of Policies DMS1 and DMH5 of the Development Management Policies Document. Combined, these policies require roof extensions that are visible from public places to not be visually intrusive, not harm the streetscene or the building's appearance and be a high quality design.

Other matters

10. Concerns have been raised regarding the effect of the proposal on neighbouring living conditions with reference to day/sunlight and noise and disturbance. However, I note the Council's comments on these matters. Furthermore, taking into account the proposal's modest scale, the effect on day/sunlight would be limited.
11. Any noise and disturbance from future occupants would be normal for a built up environment and sound insulation measures could be secured by Building Regulations. In addition, any effects from the construction period would be for a short period of time only. Based on the information before me, dismissing the appeal on the grounds of structural stability would not be justified. Moreover, this would be a matter dealt with under the Building Regulations.

Conditions

12. The conditions in the attached schedule are based on those suggested by the Council. Where necessary, the conditions have been amended in the interests of clarity and precision as required by Planning Practice Guidance.
13. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition relating to materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the noted conditions.

B Bowker

INSPECTOR