
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2019

by A Thompson BSc BTP MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/18/3214153

10 Barchard Street, London, SW18 1DU

- 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 Ms Hannah Shanks against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2018/3118, dated 21 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2018.
 - The development proposed is erection of mansard roof extension to main rear roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. I have amended the description of development set out in the banner heading above to reflect the description on the Council's decision notice, which was subsequently adopted by the appellant on their appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of 10 Barchard Street (the host building) and the Wandsworth Town Conservation Area (the conservation area).

Reasons

4. The host building is located towards the middle of a terrace of buildings, that the Council's conservation and design officer describes as simple workers' cottages. The draft appraisal document¹ states that, together with other buildings in the elbow of Armoury Way and Fairfield Street, these cottages and nearby Grapes Public House (grade II listed building) reflect the historical development of the area.
5. Although the Fairfield Street cluster of buildings within the conservation area are surrounded on three sides by more recent development of varying scale and age, they are also close to the former Ram Brewery complex and other important buildings in the town centre, which form the core of the conservation area. It is apparent from the draft appraisal document that the desire to live and work (and worship) close together was an important driver for the historical development of Wandsworth town centre and the resulting pattern of

¹ Wandsworth Town Conservation Area Appraisal (Draft)

development is evident in the historic environment that remains. In this context and given their proximity to the heart of the conservation area, the terrace of cottages in Blanchard Street make an important contribution to the significance of the conservation area as a whole.

6. The main impact of the development would be at the rear of the host building. I note that many of the properties in the terrace have been extended at the rear, at ground floor, and to a lesser extent, at first floor (including the host property). However on my site visit I did not identify other properties in the terrace that had had a rear mansard or other significant extension at roof level.
7. Although it is evident that there have been some changes in the roofing materials used and other minor alterations, the scale and pitch of the roofs at the rear of this terrace of properties are largely unaltered from their original and uniform shape.
8. Furthermore, parts of the rear elevation of the terrace, and in particular the roofscape, can be viewed from a number of points on the surrounding, and very busy, public road network, namely: Ram Street, Armoury Way and Fairfield Street. Thus although the development would be largely to the rear of the property, it would not be obscured from public view. For example, the rear roof slope of the host property is visible from the public footpath on Fairfield Street. That predominantly roofscape view of the rear of the cottages in Barchard Street is set against the backdrop of the substantial buildings on the former Ram Brewery complex.
9. Provision of a mansard roof on the rear elevation would lead to the loss of the original roof slope and break up the uniformity and original composition of the roofscape of the terrace at the rear. It would also introduce a bulky and visually intrusive feature of discordant scale and design that, in combination with the existing extensions, would dominate and compete with the character and appearance of the original cottage, in a way that would be harmful to its character and appearance.
10. In addition, I concur with the Council's concern that allowing this development might set an unwelcome precedent for similar rear roof extensions along the terrace, which would further harm the character and appearance of the terrace and the contribution it makes to the conservation area as a whole.
11. None of the precedents for the extension of properties along Barchard Street, that have been drawn to my attention by the appellant, make direct reference to a roof extension. Nor has substantive information been submitted in relation to other dormer or loft extensions in the surrounding area that have been referred to by the appellant and therefore this information is of limited weight in this case.
12. Given the scale of the works proposed and because they would be largely confined to the rear elevation of the property, I consider that the harm to the conservation area would be less than substantial, however, I have no substantive evidence before me that the development would offer public benefits which would outweigh that harm.
13. In conclusion on this issue, and having paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation

area, I find that the development would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the conservation area.

14. Accordingly, the development would conflict with policies DMS1, DMS2 and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Development Management Policies Document (2016), the National Planning Policy Framework and the Wandsworth Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2016), in so far as these policies, the guidance and the Framework seek to encourage good design and ensure that development preserves or enhances the historic environment.

Other matters

15. The appellant state that the extension would be no higher than the original ridge height. However, as the Council's Conservation and Design Officer noted, due to the very shallow pitch of roof slope it would not appear possible to create a roof extension that would give any meaningful additional space.
16. Although the plans and elevations submitted to and considered by the Council are difficult to read and lack dimensions, in my view, the existing front and rear elevations, shown on drawing reference 102, accurately records that the existing ridge is demonstrably below the level of the projecting brick courses on the chimney stack. This accords with the findings of my site visit.
17. In contrast, the proposed rear elevation shown on drawing number 104A, (but not the front elevation) indicates that the height of the ridge once extended would match the height of the projecting brick courses. If the ridge height were increased, and thus not match the adjoining properties, that would further increase the adverse impact the development would have on the character and appearance of the terrace.
18. I have sought to clarify the precise dimensions of existing and proposed development, but the provision of additional information by the appellant has not fully resolved this matter. In any event, as any consideration on this matter would not fundamentally affect my findings on the main issue, and as the appeal would in any case, be dismissed, it is not necessary for me to give further consideration to this matter.
19. I have taken particular note of the reasons for seeking to extend the dwelling and the potential benefits the proposed extension would provide for the living conditions of the appellant's family. While these factors add weight in favour of the development, they do not outweigh the harm that I have identified and the resultant conflict with the development plan.
20. I note that there have been no objections from those living in neighbouring properties to the proposals, however, this does not alter my conclusions in this case.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Anthony Thompson

INSPECTOR