
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/16/3159202

17a Barmouth Road, Wandsworth, London SW18 2DT

- 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 Richard Hutchinson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2016/3361, dated 10 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is alterations including formation of roof terrace above two-storey back addition with 1.7m high screen surround and insertion of doors in rear elevation of roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations including formation of roof terrace above two-storey back addition with 1.7m high screen surround and insertion of doors in rear elevation of roof extension, at 17a Barmouth Road, Wandsworth, London SW18 2DT, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2016/3361, dated 10 June 2016, 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: Location Plan 1:1250, 2016/072A/1, 2016/072A/2, 2016/072A/3, 2016/072A/4, 2016/072A/5, 2016/072A/6, 2016/072A/7.
 - 3) The obscured glazed screening to the roof terrace shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans before any use of the terrace commences. The obscured glazed screen shall be retained as such thereafter unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Preliminary Matter

2. The site address and description of development used above are taken from the appeal form and decision notice which are more accurate.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
-

- The living conditions of neighbouring occupants with particular reference to day/sunlight and outlook; and,
- The character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. No 17a Barmouth Road comprises an end of terrace property in use as two self-contained flats. The site is surrounded predominantly by similar residential properties including Nos 19a and 19b Barmouth Road. To the rear of the site are the rear elevations of properties along Swanage Road, including a block of apartments at Nos 12-20. The Council's concern relates to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupants at Nos 19a and 19b.
5. Whilst the party wall would increase in height, taking into account the location of windows at the rear of No 19, it would have a limited effect on neighbouring outlook. No 19's closest window to the proposal is small with a high sill, whilst the nearest habitable room window is at roof height and therefore above and away from the proposed terrace. Owing to the separation distances involved, the proposal would not harm the outlook of other neighbours in the surrounding area.
6. During my site visit, I also saw skylight windows at No 19 which would not directly face towards the proposal. Consequently, adequate levels of day/sunlight would remain for neighbours at No 19. Furthermore, taking into account the minor scale of the proposal, the effect on the living conditions of neighbours at Nos 19A and 19B would be limited.
7. In reaching this decision I have considered the Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) document which requires 50% of an outrigger to remain unaltered. However, based on my reasoning above, the proposal would meet the SPGs purpose for roof alterations to not harm the amenities of neighbours.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupants with particular reference to day/sunlight and outlook. Consequently, the proposal would meet the requirements of Policy DMS1 of the Development Management Policies Document (DMPD) which seeks to ensure development does not harm the amenity of nearby occupiers through unsatisfactory outlook or sun/daylight.

Character and appearance

9. I observed the rear of No 17 from a short passageway to the side and rear of the appeal site which terminates next to No 23. Most views of the proposal from the passageway would be limited owing to the rear garden boundaries of adjoining properties. Any limited views of the proposal would be above eye level and from short distant vantage points at the passageway. The limited views from the passageway and surrounding gardens would be in the context of surrounding rear elevations and roofs which are varied in appearance. In this respect, the proposal would not appear particularly noticeable.
10. Combined with the existing roof extension, the proposal would occupy roughly 90% of the outrigger and thus exceed the Housing SPG requirement for

development to leave up to 50% of the outrigger unaltered. However, as the purpose of this requirement is to preserve neighbouring living conditions, it is not directly applicable to this matter.

11. Moreover, the glazed screen, use of matching brick and set back of the terrace from the eaves would give the proposal a compatible, lightweight and subordinate appearance in relation to the host property. Consequently, the proposal would meet the SPG's purpose that roof alterations protect the character and appearance of the house and surrounding area.
12. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area. Consequently the proposal would meet the requirements of DMPD Policies DMS1 and DMH5 which seek to ensure that roof alterations are confined to the rear of a building, and when visible from a public place, do not harm the streetscene or the building's appearance.

Other matters

13. Concerns are raised by neighbours regarding the effect of the proposal on privacy, day/sunlight and noise and disturbance. However, the 1.7 metre high obscured glazed screen would preserve neighbouring privacy. A condition would ensure the screen is retained and installed prior to use of the terrace.
14. I also agree with the Council that the limited floor space of the terrace would prevent excessively large or noisy gatherings to occur. In addition, the capability of the roof to support the terrace is a matter for the Building Regulations stage.
15. I also understand the personal circumstances of the appellant. However, as I have found no harm in relation to the main issues above, I have not considered this matter any further.

Conditions

16. The conditions noted above are based on those as suggested by the Council, and where necessary, they have been altered in the interests of clarity and precision as required by the Planning Practice Guidance.
17. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. A condition requiring installation of the obscure glazed screen prior to the use of the terrace is necessary based on my reasoning above.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, and having taken all matters raised into account, I conclude the appeal should be allowed subject to the noted conditions.

B Bowker

INSPECTOR