
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2019

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/19/3232179

34 Putney High Street, London SW15 1SQ

- 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 Tim Binnington (Headmasters Partnership Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2019/0617, dated 11 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is 2 x storey rear extension to the existing building to create 2 x 2 bedroom flats on the upper floors only.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant's name is incorrectly spelt on the application form, because it is apparent from the evidence that the appellant's name is Binnington. For consistency, I have used the surname Binnington in the above heading.
3. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, requires that I pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, a locally listed building, and the Putney Embankment Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. No.34 Putney High Street is a three-storey mid-terraced property located within the Putney Embankment Conservation Area (CA). The CA Appraisal identifies the three eighteenth century former houses at 32-36 Putney High Street as locally listed for their importance in the history of the High Street. The rear of the appeal property faces Weimar Street. The CA appraisal acknowledges the importance of Weimar Street to the CA. It states at paragraph 6.8 that views of the rear elevations of 28 to 50 Putney High Street are highly important and should be considered when extensions and other alterations are planned. It particularly highlights the importance of the rear elevations of the appeal property and its neighbours referred to in the CA Appraisal as a row of eighteenth-century former townhouses.

6. The proposed extension according to the appellant would project 3.25 metres out from the rear elevation. The extension would be set below the parapet of the existing building. It would cover over half of the width of the elevation but would retain the long sliding sash window which provides light to the staircase.
7. The appellant highlights that the rear of properties facing Weimar Street have been extended and altered. No 32 has significant and visible ground and first floor extensions with alterations and external staircase to the second floor that sit close to the joint boundary with the appeal site. No 36 has a first-floor flat roofed extension covering about half the width of the first-floor elevation and, although relatively small scale and partly hidden by the boundary wall, is visible from Weimar Street. The ground floor of the appeal property has been extended, to almost the full depth of the rear yard. The extension sits just above the boundary wall to Weimar Street and is largely hidden from view. Despite these additions, the Georgian rear elevation of the upper floors of the appeal site with its vertical sliding sash windows, consistent building line with no 36, and no 32 at second floor level, brickwork, chimneys, and parapet detail positively contribute to the significance of the conservation area and remain prominent features when viewed from Weimar Street.
8. The size and siting of the proposed extension would introduce significant additional mass to the rear elevation. It would extend beyond the original, and readily visible, building line of the Georgian façade, encompassing the second floor, where there is no other extension of this height and projection. This would result in a development that would be a prominent and harmful addition to the street scene. Further, the design of the new rear elevation with its door openings, juliet balconies and window detail would introduce a design with a horizontal emphasis that is not comparable with the refined detailing of the existing Georgian elevation.
9. I find that the extension would detract from, and be harmful to, the intrinsic character of the host building which has acknowledged historic value and diminishes the positive contribution the building makes to the character and appearance of the CA.
10. Overall, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the host property or the Putney Embankment Conservation Area. I conclude that the proposed rear extension would conflict with Policies DMS1, DMS2 and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document Adopted March 2016 which collectively seek development that is of high quality, that enhances the significance of heritage assets and which respects the design and materials of the original building.
11. Putney Embankment Conservation Area is a designated heritage asset as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework). Paragraph 193 states that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm. Paragraph 194 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. The harm I have identified in the context of the Framework would be less than substantial. The Framework requires that less than substantial harm be weighed against the public benefits.
12. The appeal property is a non-designated heritage asset. Paragraph 197 of the Framework also requires that the effect of a development on the significance of

a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining planning applications.

13. I acknowledge that the extension would provide new living accommodation in an accessible location. However, whilst I agree that providing good quality housing in accessible locations is important and should be afforded some weight, this would not outweigh the great weight to be given to the less than substantial harm I have identified to the significance of the CA or the harm to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. I have also taken into account that the appellant has considered the previous appeal dismissal and sought to address the concerns that were raised in that decision. However, for the reasons given above, the considerable changes to the scheme do not outweigh or justify the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

14. I find that overall the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA, would cause less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset and harm the significance of a non-designated heritage asset. No material considerations or public benefits have been put forward that would outweigh the harm identified in those respects.
15. For the reasons given above I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR