

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2017

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 04 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/17/3169855

110 Coteford Street, London SW17 8NY

- 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 Dr and Mrs I and R Marshall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application, Ref. 2016/6898, dated 28 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and part side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and part side extension at 110 Coteford Street, London SW17 in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 2016/6898, dated 28 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision;
 - 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 1573 05F; 1573 06F; 1573 07E & 1573 08F;
 - 3) The facing brickwork to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match that used in the existing building;
 - 4) The roof of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden, sitting out area or for any purpose of a similar nature.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and whether the character or appearance of the Totterdown Fields Conservation Area would be preserved or enhanced, and (ii) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions for adjoining occupiers as regards outlook and privacy.

Reasons

3. On the first issue, the Council's concern is that the combination of the building's height and design would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the conservation area. However, as regards the effect on the existing building, the extension would project a relatively modest 2.7m from the rear elevation, and although there is a wrap-
-

around element this would extend only about 2m along the side elevation at its most rearward point. The building's height would be consistent with a single storey extension and although the design is somewhat utilitarian I consider that the proposed addition would be clearly subservient to the host dwelling and not cause it harm in terms of either its character or appearance.

4. From the public realm in Coteford Street the extension would be well set back and would not compromise the pleasing gap between Nos. 110 and No. 108 as end of terrace properties. The side elevation as illustrated on Drawing No. 06F is somewhat plain, but this would only be seen in oblique views by passers by, with the building's visual impact further reduced by the front fencing and the landscaping in the gardens of Nos. 108 and 110.
5. The public and private views from Cowick Road and its houses are referred to in the Council's appraisal, but I consider that the combination of the distance from those vantage points and relatively modest scale of the extension do not raise any matters of concern. On this issue I therefore conclude that there would be no harm caused to either the character or appearance of the host building or the conservation area.
6. Turning to the second issue, the Council considers that the addition would be overbearing for the occupiers of No. 112, the adjoining terrace house. However, with the exception of a small window serving either a WC or utility room, this part of No. 112's rear elevation is blank. I therefore do not consider that even allowing for the different levels of the two rear gardens, there would be a significant effect on the neighbour's outlook.
7. The 'landing' and steps would project just under a metre from the building at a height of about half a metre, but whilst this would give rise to the possibility of limited views over the fence into the rear garden of No. 112 this could be prevented by the addition of a trellis and planting at the top of the fence to maintain a reasonable level of privacy. On this issue I do not consider that the outlook or privacy for the occupiers of No. 112 would be materially affected.
8. For the reasons explained I conclude that there would not be a harmful conflict with Policies DMS1, DMS2 & DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document 2016; the Council's Housing SPD Review 2016 and Government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. The appeal is therefore allowed.
9. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition requiring facing brickwork to match that of the host building will maintain visual amenity. Finally, a condition precluding the use of the flat roof as an amenity area will maintain neighbours' privacy. I have not imposed a condition in relation to raising the height of the fence, as on the evidence before me I am unable to assess whether this would be reasonable and necessary. However it would remain an option for the occupiers of No. 112 should they consider that their privacy was being invaded.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR