

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2017

**by D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

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

**Decision date: 5 April 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/17/3166800**  
**50 Penwortham Road, London, SW16 6RE**

- 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 James Capp against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
  - The application Ref 2016/5398, dated 15 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2016.
  - The development proposed is alterations including erection of part single-storey/ part two-storey side and rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more precise than the planning application form; I note the Appellant also uses this description on the appeal form.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on, firstly, the character and appearance of the locality and, secondly, on the living conditions for neighbours.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a three storey terraced home with a rear garden in an established fairly tightly knit residential area with generally elevationally pleasing houses and a character of interest and aesthetic quality. The property presently includes a flat roofed single storey extension across part of its rear elevation and this has set the depth for the new works. The appeal scheme would see the ground element running across the whole property width at the rear and a first floor over this set in about 1.2m on its south west side and sitting under a flat roof. The development would provide for an extended family room with extensive glazing and doors to the garden and fifth bedroom and new bathroom.

#### *Character and appearance*

5. The treatment of rear elevations is varied in this stretch of street. The local idiom often appears as a sympathetic lower two storey element, modest in depth, with a mono-pitch roof running up to the main rear elevation. There are
-

also 3 storey semi-detached outriggers which do not run across the whole host properties, again have limited depth, and include pitched roofs. Unfortunately the appeal proposal would look extremely awkward in its wider context and alongside the host property. This would not be a suitably subtle approach. The overall projection would be too great, the width excessive, the windows unbalanced and the flat roof alien. The result would be an extension which would fail to look subordinate to the original home and would appear overly dominant. This overwhelming extension would be jarring on the eye and would not represent good quality design in this built development and garden context. It would detract from the aesthetic qualities of the original building and neighbouring properties.

6. Taken together, Policies DMS1 and DMH5 of the Council's Development Management Policy Document 2016 (DMPD) call for, amongst other matters, high quality design sympathetic to, and in scale with, the original building and its wider setting. I conclude that the appeal scheme would run contrary to these policies. It would also conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Housing* (SPD) which shares the objectives of the above policies.

#### *Living conditions*

7. The extension by reason of its scale and positioning would result in a very unfortunate mass of vertical walling on view from and closely alongside the neighbouring properties. Rear gardens are not overly generous, rear access passageways are tight and window positions are varied and the result is that any proposals for extension work would have to be carefully considered. In this instance the proposed bulky scheme would represent a 'step too far' and would give rise to a sense for neighbours of being hemmed-in and dominated by an overbearing structure which, even with this orientation, would also reduce outlook and light levels.
8. DMPD Policy DMS1, and the SPD, also seek to prevent harm to the amenities of neighbours. I conclude that this scheme would run contrary to this policy objective for the reasons I have given.

#### *Other matters*

9. I sympathise with the wish to extend this family dwelling. I could see that there was some variation in the form of extensions which have taken place locally, albeit I do not know the full circumstances of all this work. However, those I could view did generally appear to be suitably subordinate in nature. In any event I have to determine this case on its own merits. I can understand the practical reasoning for the use of a flat roof given nearby windows and an aim to minimise bulk, I note the intentions on good quality materials, and I fully appreciate that the scheme is not visible from publically accessible vantage points. I recognise that neighbours, who include flat occupiers, did not object, although I have to consider residential amenity inherent in a property for the long term. I understand that neighbouring proposals may be emerging but these are not before me.
10. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issues identified above.

11. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within the Framework.

*Overall conclusion*

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locality and on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

*D Cramond*

INSPECTOR