

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2017

by P G Horridge BSc(Hons) DipTP FRICS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/16/3161581

57 Galgate Close, London SW19 6EU

- 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 Mrs Vivienne Avery against the decision of Wandsworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/2720 was refused by notice dated 1 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is an additional storey to a house.
-

Preliminary Matters

1. The council's appeal questionnaire says that the site lies within a Green Belt. However, the council has subsequently confirmed that this is incorrect.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

3. At issue are the effects of the proposal on the appearance of the streetscene and on the living conditions of residents of neighbouring properties.

Reasons

4. Relevant planning policies are contained in the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (DMPD) (adopted 2016) and the Supplementary Planning Document on Housing (SPD) (adopted 2015). DMPD Policy DMS 1 sets out general development principles, while DMH 5 deals specifically with alterations and extensions.
 5. The appeal property is part of a development of two- and three-storey modern terrace houses mainly set around an open grassed area. The three-storey elements flank three of the sides of this green. Within each of these terraces are a number of single two-storey houses. The appeal property is one such house and the proposal is to introduce a third storey of generally matching design to the three-storey houses to either side.
 6. The council argues that there is a particular rhythm to these terraces, with the two-storey houses occurring every fourth property, but as the appellant points out this is not a consistent pattern. In some cases it is every fifth house which is two-storey, while there is a continuous row of 8 three-storey houses diagonally opposite the appeal property. It is argued that the appeal proposal will result in the terrace in which it is situated mirroring this row. However,
-

these 8 houses are all in the same vertical plane, sharing a common building line, whereas the neighbour to the north of the appeal property, 56, is staggered behind the building line of the appeal property. To achieve a transition between the two, the proposed additional storey of the appeal property would also be set back. This would differentiate the appeal property from other three-storey houses in the development, making it a visually discordant feature that would detract from the appearance of the streetscene.

7. At the rear of the property, the additional storey would be carried back to align with the rear wall of 56. That would result in it projecting beyond the rear of 58. Notwithstanding that the council did not consider its effects on neighbouring residents to be unacceptable, this would diminish the outlook from that property and make it a less pleasant place in which to live.
8. The appellant notes that the two-storey houses suffer from damp problems arising from their location between three-storey properties. She also requires additional space for her family. These are important considerations but they do not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the appearance of the streetscene and the living conditions of residents of 58 Galgate Close. In these respects, the proposal would be contrary to relevant development plan policies, notably DMPD Policy DMS 1 (b) which requires the scale, massing and appearance of development to contribute positively to local spatial character, DMS 1 (c) which seeks to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents, and DMH 5 (ii) which notes that extensions or alterations to roofs should not harm the streetscene.

Peter Horridge

INSPECTOR