



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2017

by Stephen Normington BSc DipTP MRICS MRTPI FIQ FIHE

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

Decision date: 22 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/17/3173849
2B Belleville Road, London SW11 6QT

- 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 Alistair Russell Smith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2017/0502, dated 26 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of hipped to gable and rear dormer roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a two-storey end terraced dwelling, in a block of four similar properties, located on the south side of Belleville Road and lying within the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area. Properties on the street comprise predominantly of terraced dwellings that have a semi-detached appearance in the street. This effect is created by protruding frontages that are closely positioned to each other with properties co-joined by side wings that are set well back from the front façade. As a consequence, the front part of the roof of most of the properties facing the street was formally hipped.
4. The appeal property has an unaltered hipped roof. Although most other properties on the street have had significant roof extensions, these have been predominantly undertaken in a manner which retains elements of the former hipped roof in the new roof construction. This is clearly evident in views of the property frontages from the street. Although the roof form of most properties has been considerably altered, the street still retains the appearance of frontages that display full and part hipped roof elements. As such, hipped roof features continue to form an integral part of the appearance and character of the street.
5. The property at No 4, which forms the opposite end of the terrace block containing the appeal property, has also been subject to significant roof

- extensions at the rear of the property. However, the frontage still retains the appearance of a hipped roof in views from the street.
6. By contrast, the rear of properties in the vicinity have a variety of significant roof and rear extensions which display little, if any, consistency in design, scale and mass. However, due to the terraced nature of the surrounding streets, views of the rear of most of the properties on this side of the street are restricted to those from the rear of properties and gardens on Kelmscott Road.
 7. The proposed development would involve the construction of hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer roof extension. Fenestration and materials would match those used in the existing property.
 8. Unlike most of the other properties on the street that have had roof extensions, the proposed hip to gable roof extension in this case would completely eliminate any evidence of a former hipped roof by the formation of a true gable. As such, this roof design would not be consistent with the prevailing character of other roofs on the street. Moreover, it would unacceptably unbalance the appearance of the terraced block.
 9. The incongruity of roof design would be emphasised by the prominent position of the appeal property at the junction with Bollingbroke Grove. As such in views down the street from this junction, the roof of the appeal property would appear at odds with the prevailing character of the rest of the street.
 10. The proposed rear dormer would be set down from the extended ridge of the roof of the property, set in from the flanks and set behind the eaves with fenestration to match the existing features of the rear of the house. In the context of the proposed extended roof it would appear as an acceptable and subordinate addition to the property. However, its construction is reliant on the formation of the hip to gable roof extension, which for the reasons outlined above, would be an incongruous addition to the property. Consequently, the overall proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area.
 11. Against that background, I conclude that the proposed development neither preserves nor enhances the character or appearance of the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area. In the context of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset. Although I consider the harm to be less than substantial, any harm should require clear and convincing justification. In this case there are no public benefits that would outweigh the harm.
 12. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and would not accord with paragraphs 131 and 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework. It would also be contrary to Policies DMS1, DMS2 and DMS5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2016). These policies, amongst other things, require that development should conserve the appearance and character of heritage assets and also conserve the features and elements that contribute to the character of a heritage asset. In addition, roof extensions that are visible from the street should be sympathetic to the style of the building and not harm the appearance of the building or the street scene.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, taking into account the development plan as a whole based on the evidence before me and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stephen Normington

INSPECTOR