

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2019

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/19/3225558

111 Twilley Street, London SW18 4NW

- 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 Jonathon Moore against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2019/0280, dated 22 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a roof extension above a two-storey back addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The appellant has suggested that the same development as the appeal proposal could be achieved by using, in part, permitted development rights. However, that is not a matter for me to determine in the context of an appeal made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. It is open to the appellant to apply to have the matter determined under sections 191 or 192 of the Act, and any such application would be unaffected by my determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey terraced house, with an existing loft conversion and short rear extension at second floor level. It sits within a terrace of similar properties which back on to the River Wandle, with a traffic-free pedestrian and cycle route, playing fields, and a skate park/BMX track beyond.
5. The development proposed is the erection of a rear extension at second floor level, which would be built above the existing two storey rear outrigger. This would lengthen the existing dormer to almost the full depth of the outrigger below.
6. The slight amount by which the proposal would be set back from the rear end wall and in from the eaves of the existing outrigger below would not be

sufficient to mitigate its size and dominant appearance. Its length and width would almost be the same as the existing outrigger, and the large flat roofed structure which would result would be out of keeping with the mainly pitched roof style of the original building. Although the extension has been designed to use materials matching the existing dwelling, it would nonetheless appear as a top-heavy and unsympathetic addition to the building.

7. The development would be prominent in views both from the public path and open spaces across the River Wandle to the west, and from the Kimber Road bridge across the river to the north. The proposed extension would be a bulky and incongruous addition to the existing house and its terrace as a whole, and would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of both the host building and the wider area.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of developments elsewhere in the borough where similar extensions running the full depth, or almost the full depth, of rear outriggers have been built. I am not aware of the full circumstances in each case, but in any event the fact that apparently similar extensions may have been permitted elsewhere is not in itself a reason to allow unacceptable development. In addition, the examples of roof terraces which have been permitted within the same block as the appeal property are not strictly comparable in scale with the proposed extension in this case. I have considered this proposal on its own merits and find that it would cause harm as described above.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the wider area. Its form and bulk would lead to it dominating the original property, while also making it intrusive and harmful to the surrounding area. As a result, it would conflict with the guidance within the council's Housing Supplementary Planning Document (adopted in November 2016), and would be contrary to Policies DMS1 'General development principles' and DMH5 'Alterations and extensions' of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (adopted in March 2016). In combination, these policies seek to protect the character and appearance of the area. For the same reasons, it would be contrary to the provisions of the 2019 National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs 127 and 130 which seek to achieve well-designed places.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters which have been raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector