
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2019

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/18/3218750
42 Ellerton Road, London SW18 3NN

- 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 Daniel Belshaw against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2018/4404, dated 13 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is erection of side dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of side dormer at 42 Ellerton Road, London SW18 3NN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2018/4404, dated 13 September 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 01, 06, 07, 08 and 9.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special regard be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
4. The CA was designated in 1986 and as identified by the Council's draft Conservation Area Appraisal (2007) (CAA), the appeal site is located within Sub Area 'g'. Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework places a requirement on applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by a proposal. Whilst limited information was provided in the application, the significance has been adequately described in the evidence before me in a manner that is proportionate to the assets' importance.
5. The CAA identifies that the architecture in the Sub Area is predominantly low in scale and properties are generally emphasised with simple architectural detailing and elaborately pitched roofs. Although there is variety in the

appearance of the buildings, consistent architectural themes run throughout the CA in terms of facing materials as well as roof forms and pitches. It is from this consistency that the CA derives much of its significance.

6. However, there are also numerous examples of roof alterations within the Sub Area, including many dormer windows located in the side roof slopes of dwellings. The prevalence of these roof alterations is such that they contribute to the established character and appearance of the CA. Moreover, where they exist, they are generally subordinate to the overall form of the house due to their scale and location in the roof slope. Consequently, they are generally well proportioned and are not dominant features within the roofscape. Accordingly, they do not detract from the character and appearance of the CA.
7. The appeal site is a semi-detached red brick dwelling with a hipped roof and swept eaves detail as well as two chimney stacks. The property also has a full height bay window that sits under a small gable fronted roof projection. It forms part of a group of houses that together are experienced as an architectural set piece. Due to the form and appearance of the dwelling, it is typical to the Sub Area and consequently, it makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
8. The proposal would introduce a dormer window into the side facing roof slope of the dwelling. It would have a flat roof which would be lower than the overall ridge height of the house and it would also be set back from the front of the property. Consequently, although the dormer window would be located behind a chimney stack, due to its scale and position in the roof slope, the proposal would be entirely framed by the roof and subordinate to its overall form. It would therefore be complementary to the other dormer windows located within the Sub Area. It would also not be visually intrusive to the appearance of the building or the composition of the four pairs of houses in which it is situated. Instead, for the above reasons, the proposal would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the CA. Due to this lack of harm, there is no need to assess the appeal against the public benefits of the proposal.
9. For the reasons identified above, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It would therefore accord with Policies DMS1, DMS2 and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan, Development Management Policies Document (2016) and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016). Taken together, these policies seek a design-led approach to development that is not visually intrusive, does not harm either the street scene or the appearance of the building, and sustains, conserves and where appropriate, enhances the significance, appearance, character and setting of the Heritage Asset.

Conditions and Conclusion

10. Conditions are necessary to establish the time limit for the commencement of development and to list the approved drawing numbers. Due to the details on the approved drawings, no other conditions are necessary.
11. For the reasons identified above, the appeal is allowed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR