

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2018

**by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 11 April 2018**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/17/3179016**

### **17 West Hill, London SW18 1RB**

- 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 Julian Cookson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
  - The application Ref 2017/2355, dated 25 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2017.
  - The development proposed is erection of a mansard roof extension to provide additional floor of residential accommodation.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Main Issue**

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area bearing in mind it would be within the Wandsworth Town Conservation Area (CA) and within the settings of No 23, Nos 25 and 27, Nos 29 and 31, No 33 and Nos 35 and 37 West Hill (Nos 23 to 37) all of which are grade II listed.

### **Reasons**

3. The appeal property is a three storey mid-terrace within the CA. To the west are the grade II listed Nos 23 to 37.
4. In accordance with the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. Furthermore, section 66(1) of the same Act requires that special regard must be had to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings. Moreover, paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of new development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
5. The CA is characterised by traditional buildings with consistent architectural details and materials in a variety of uses gathered around an historic street pattern. In my view, the significance of the CA is derived from the formal layout of development and traditional architectural detailing of the buildings within it. As such the grade II listed No 23 to 37 all have attractive formal details including parapets and gauged flat arches which their significance deriving from their traditional and formal architectural detailing.

6. I note the proposed extension would be constructed using materials which would match the appeal dwelling and its form would be similar to the roofs of other properties nearby. I acknowledge that due to the height of the appeal building close range views of the proposed mansard roof extension would be restricted.
7. However, the proposed extension would be visible when approaching the appeal site from either direction on West Hill. It would rise above the parapet wall detail which is a consistent and attractive linear feature of the West Hill road frontage.
8. As such, in breaching the attractive and simple roof line, the proposed extension would draw the eye and would be a prominent and discordant addition to the appeal building and the wider terrace. For these reasons it would harm and fail to preserve the significance and the character and appearance of the CA and the settings of the grade II listed Nos 23 to 37.
9. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the provisions of the respective sections of the Act and would fail to accord with paragraph 132 of the Framework, which attaches great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets. It would also be in conflict with Policy 7.8 of the London Plan<sup>1</sup>, Policies PL 1 and IS 3 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Core Strategy (2016), and Policies DMS 1, DMS 2 and DMH 5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies (2016) which taken together seek to ensure good design and protect heritage assets from harm. For the same reasons it would also conflict with the good design and conservation aims of the Wandsworth Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Housing (2016), the Wandsworth Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document: Historic Environment (2016) and the Wandsworth Town Conservation Area Appraisal (Draft).
10. That said, in accordance with paragraphs 133 and 134 of the Framework, this harm would be less than substantial. In these circumstances, the Framework requires the degree of harm to be balanced against any public benefits the development may bring.
11. There would be some public benefits, such as additional living accommodation close to services and facilities such that they could be easily accessed through walking and cycling. It would also be in an area with good public transport connections and there would be economic benefits associated with construction. However, the combined benefits are modest, and do not outweigh the great weight I attach to the harm I have identified to the designated heritage assets.

## **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons set out above and with regard to all other matters raised, I conclude on balance that the proposal would not accord with the development plan and therefore the appeal should be dismissed.

*L Fleming*  
INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> The London Plan– The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011 (2016)