The Planning Inspectorate

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/W/16/3165585
131 Lower Richmond Road, London SW15 1EZ

- 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 Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
- The application Ref 2016/4544, dated 30 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2016.
- The development proposed is described as 'Erection of roof extension'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out in the banner heading above, which is taken from the application form, it is evident from the submitted plans that the proposed development is a mansard roof extension and a roof terrace. The appeal form describes the appeal proposal as a 'mansard roof extension and roof terrace'. This revised description more appropriately describes the proposed development and so I have considered the appeal on that basis as neither of the parties would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me taking this course of action.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 3 storey mid-terraced building situated on the south side of Lower Richmond Road. The ground floor is in use as a shop with residential accommodation on the upper floors. Although mansards are a feature in the centre of the block, both ends of the terrace are framed by groups of buildings featuring distinctive front gables with subordinate pitched roofs set behind. The appeal property is located within the group of buildings which book-ends the eastern end of the terraced block.

5. The proposed mansard roof extension would be a substantial addition to the roof of the appeal property. The development would extend the full width and the majority of the depth of the main roof and would be set back only slightly behind, and finish higher than, the gable feature, which would be retained.

6. By reason of its siting, scale, mass and form, the proposed mansard roof extension would be a dominant and discordant feature which would be highly visible in views along Lower Richmond Road. The appeal proposal would therefore disrupt the established architectural form and rhythm of the appeal property and group of buildings at the eastern end of the terrace and, in doing so, would harm the visual unity of the terraced block as a whole.

7. The Council raise no objection to the proposed roof terrace above part of the rear outrigger, concluding that it would not be too large or overbearing and would not harm the character and appearance of the existing building. Based on the evidence before me and my observations on site I see no reason to take a different view. However, the absence of harm in relation to this element of the proposed development does not lead me to find the appeal proposal acceptable overall and, since it is an integral part of the scheme, it is not clearly severable.

8. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect upon the character and the appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. As such, the appeal proposal would be contrary to the design aims of Policies DMS 1 and DMH 5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document.

9. In addition to the development plan policies referred to above, I have had regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). For the reasons set out above, the proposed development would not create a high quality built environment as required by the social and environmental roles set out in paragraph 7 of the Framework. The three dimensions of sustainable development are mutually dependent, and I consider that the conflict with the social and environmental dimensions would outweigh any positive contributions the appeal proposal would make towards the economic dimension. Therefore, the proposal would not constitute sustainable development when assessed against the policies contained within the Framework as a whole.

Conclusion

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

C L Humphrey

INSPECTOR