The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2019 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) PIEMA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/19/3237460
302 Huntingfield Road, London SW15 5ER

- 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 Tina Grisenthwaite against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
- The application Ref 2019/1041, dated 7 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2019.
- The development proposed is a single storey ground and first floor rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey ground and first floor rear extension at 302 Huntingfield Road, London SW15 5ER in accordance with the application, Ref 2019/1041, dated 7 March 2019 subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

    2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development herby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

    3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: HUN/SDC/01PL Rev A (dated 03/09/2019) and unnumbered plan at 1:1250 scale (Site Location Plan).

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The appellant has submitted an amended plan (HUN/SDC/01PL Rev A dated 03/09/2019) which shows a flat roof design instead of a pitched roof and symmetrical fenestration across the width of the first floor extension. The changes shown are minor and do not have a significant effect on the nature of the development. There seems no reason why accepting this plan should prejudice the Council, or any other party, and it therefore forms the basis for this decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area which is within the Dover House Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two storey residential dwelling located in the middle of a short terrace of houses that, from the front, are generally consistent in their scale, appearance and design. The carefully considered terrace and uniformity in design is a typical feature of the CA generally. I consider its front elevation to be its most important feature in the CA as views of the rear of the property are not publicly available. Indeed, the frontage of the appeal property contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA.

6. Immediately to the rear of the back garden of the appeal property is Queen Mary's Hospital. The large contemporary hospital building is significantly taller than the appeal property and the building is dominant in views from the house and back garden. The hospital is located outside the CA. I understand some buildings at the hospital are listed, but as there is a fence running along the back of the gardens which screens views from the hospital grounds to the appeal property the development would cause no harm to the setting of the listed buildings.

7. I saw, during my site visit, that the roofline at the rear of the terrace is not uniform due to the rear extension at No. 296 Huntingfield Road. Although this extension is of a different design to the proposal, it has similar proportions and is located on the same short terrace as the appeal property. Whilst the majority of the properties on the terrace do not feature rear extensions or alterations, the presence of the rear extension at No. 296 has already disrupted the uniformity of the rear of the terrace and therefore the change to the roofline and the rear elevation as a result of the proposal will not cause unacceptable disharmony to the terrace. The scale and design of the proposal is such that it would not compete with or overly dominate the appeal property, and the use of materials to match the existing dwelling will also ensure the extension does not harm the character and appearance of the terrace, and this can be secured by imposition of a condition.

8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It would accord with Policy DMS1, DMS2 and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (March 2016) which amongst other things seek to protect local character and appearance, including in relation to the historic environment. The proposal is not contrary to guidance within the Dover House Estate Conservation Area Appraisal Document in relation to extensions.

Conditions

9. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have included a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is allowed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR