The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2017

by J A B Gresty MA MRICS

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

Decision date: 17 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/17/3166730
44 Headington Road, London SW18 3PP

- 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 Sara Chamberlain against the decision of Council for the London Borough of Wandsworth.
- The application Ref 2016/5941, dated 11 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2016.
- The development proposed is a front porch and a rear first floor single storey extension. This will allow for a larger wc and entrance hallway on the ground floor and it will allow for an additional bedroom and shower room at first floor level. Two new side facing windows will be installed and one velux window to provide natural light to staircase and hallway.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 46 Headington Road with respect to outlook and light and its effect on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, end of terrace house. The appeal proposal includes construction of a first floor extension which would project about four metres from the main rear elevation of the house. The appeal property is situated further back from the road than neighbouring property at 46 Headington Road and, consequently, the rear extension would in part stand adjacent to that part of the back garden which is closest to the house at No 46. Because of the appeal property's position to the south of No 46, the proposed first floor extension would cast shade onto No 46's back garden and nearest ground floor windows at certain times of day. This would have a significant adverse effect the living conditions of the occupiers of No 46, contrary to Policy DMS 1 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Polices Document (DMPD) which requires new development not to harm the amenities of occupiers of nearby properties.

4. The proposed extension would have an eaves height to match the existing house and the flank wall would appear tall and, partly as a consequence of its position to the south, dark when viewed from No 46's back garden and ground floor windows. Whilst the ridge of the hipped roof would be lower than that of the main house roof, the height and dark appearance of the flank wall combined with its rear projection and location close to No 46's back garden would result in it being an unduly prominent feature, to the extent that it would appear overbearing when viewed from No 46. This would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 46, contrary to DMPD Policy DMS 1.

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal property is situated in the Magdalen Park Conservation Area. This part of the Conservation Area is characterised by terraces of two-storey houses of similar design set out in a regular pattern, giving the area a strongly planned and designed character and appearance. The appeal property forms part of a terrace which largely retains its original symmetrical and designed appearance when viewed from the road, contributing positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

6. The appeal proposal includes construction of a small, single-storey front porch. The front wall of the porch would be in line with the front elevation of the house's adjoining two-storey bay and the extension would occupy the whole of the set-back to the side of the bay. This would result in a loss of definition of the front bay which is a strong visual characteristic of the appeal property and the terrace as a whole. Also, it would result in a distinct loss of symmetry of the terrace with consequential harm to the designed appearance of the terrace in the street scene. In this respect the proposed porch would not preserve the character or appearance of this part of the Conservation Area and it would not meet the requirements of DMPD Policy DMS 2.

7. No 46 next door has a front porch which infills the setback in a similar way to that proposed. However, the porch is not an original feature of that property and it does not reflect the prevailing planned and designed character and appearance of its host terrace or this part of the Conservation Area. Whilst the proposed porch would have a hipped roof which would better reflect the character of the properties in the local area than the mono-pitch roof of the porch at No 46, this would not justify the replication of unsympathetic developments which cumulatively would have a significantly adverse effect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

8. Views of the proposed first floor rear extension from the public domain of the road would be very limited. In this respect the rear extension would have very little effect on the appearance of the appeal property when viewed from the front and consequently the extension would maintain the planned character and appearance of Headington Road and the development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, in accordance with the aims of DMPD Policy DMS 2.

9. The rear extension would occupy nearly two-thirds of the width of the rear elevation of the appeal property. This, in combination with its height and projection, would result in the extension appearing large in relation to the host property, to the extent that it would dominate the appearance of the rear

elevation of the property. In this respect the rear extension would fail to comply with DMPD Policy DMH 5 which requires extensions to residential properties not to dominate the original building.

10. Further, the flank wall of the rear extension would continue the line of the end wall of the appeal property without a distinct visual break. Whilst the extension would include a small window in its flank wall and a new small window would be formed in the side of the existing house to provide light to the repositioned bathroom, the flank wall of the extension would be largely blank. This would combine with the lack of visual break between it and the host property to give the extension a large and bulky appearance when viewed from No 46. This would not contribute positively to the appearance of the appeal property.

11. Overall, whilst not open to public view from the road, when viewed from nearby gardens and properties, the proposed rear extension would appear large and bulky in relation to the host property and terrace as a whole. Consequently the extension would detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the local area to the rear of the appeal property and would not meet the aims of DMPD Polices DMS 1 and DMH 5 in this respect.

Conclusion

12. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, new development should respond to local character and it should make places better for people. Also, Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Whilst the proposed extensions include features, such as hipped roofs, which would reflect the design of the host property, overall they fail to preserve the character and appearance of the local area and the Magdalen Park Conservation Area. Further, the rear extension would have a significantly adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property. Therefore, the proposed development would not represent sustainable development as sought by the Framework and, on balance and for the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J A B Gresty

INSPECTOR