

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2017

by C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/16/3165549
2 Oakhill Road, London SW15 2QU

- 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 Daniel James against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2016/4454, dated 28 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and first floor side extension; reconfiguration of western dormer and ground floor entrance and further external alterations including new windows, rooflights and glazed sliding doors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the East Putney Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached Old English cottage style 2 storey house located on the south side of Oakhill Road within East Putney Conservation Area (the Conservation Area). The character of the Conservation Area derives from the varied form of the predominantly residential development. Oakhill Road has a spacious quality and is lined with 2 and 3 storey detached and semi-detached houses set in wide plots with generous spacing between the buildings.
 4. The eaves of the proposed first floor side extension would be higher than those on the rest of the house and the creation of a sizeable crown roof would add considerably to the bulk of the roof as a whole. Despite being hipped above the east elevation, the extension would infill much of the gap between the appeal property and 4 Oakhill Road. The proposed addition of dormer windows to the front and rear and enlargement of the dormer on the west elevation would add further mass to the overall roof form. Moreover, the appeal proposal would result in the loss of the characteristic tall chimneys and timber detailing which add vertical emphasis to the appeal property, and would significantly reduce the prominence of the catslide roof. This, combined with the additional width of the proposed first floor side extension and side dormer, would give the appeal property an overly elongated horizontal appearance.
-

5. The Council raise no objection to the proposed single storey rear extension, concluding that it would read as a subservient addition to and in keeping with the host property. Based on the evidence before me I have no reason to take a different view. The proposed replacement rear bay window would be a modest addition with a shallow hipped roof which would sit comfortably beneath the gable and therefore be acceptable in this context. However, the absence of harm in relation to these elements of the scheme does not lead me to find the appeal proposal acceptable overall and, since they are intrinsic to the development as a whole, these elements are not clearly severable.
6. Overall, the proposed development would be excessively dominant and unsympathetic, significantly eroding the spacious setting of the appeal property and diminishing its established architectural features. The proposed use of matching roof slates and black painted fascia boards and the slight set-back from the front building line would not ameliorate these harmful effects. Whilst the existing timbers could be painted white, what is before me is a proposal to remove them entirely which would have a greater effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property.
7. The house at 2A Oakhill Road has been the subject of fairly recent alterations. I am not aware of the full planning history of this development, however it appears from the evidence before me and my observations on site that the works to No 2A differ in their siting, scale and form to the appeal scheme and therefore it is not possible to make a direct comparison. There is a dormer to the side of the property opposite the appeal site. Whilst I do not have details of the planning history of this development, the scale, siting and architectural form of that building differ considerably to the appeal property. As such, the circumstances of that scheme are not comparable with the appeal proposal. I have therefore afforded these other developments only limited weight.
8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the East Putney Conservation Area. As such, it would conflict with the design, heritage conservation and protection aims of Policies DMS 2 and DMH 5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document and the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework).
9. As set out in paragraph 132 of the Framework, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Any harm requires clear and convincing justification. In the parlance of the Framework, the identified harm to the designated heritage asset is less than substantial and should therefore be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The provision of additional living space, daylight and sunlight within the appeal property does not amount to a public benefit sufficient to outweigh the harm caused to the designated heritage asset.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

CL Humphrey

INSPECTOR