



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 6 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/19/3234702

191a Bedford Hill, London, SW12 9HQ

- 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 and Mrs Berry against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2019/1831, dated 24 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor extension to ground floor dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No 207 Bedford Hill, with particular regard to visual impact and outlook.

Reasons

4. No 191a is a modest, flat-roofed, single-storey end of terrace dwelling, located within a residential area predominantly characterised by two-storey terraced properties. The side elevation of the appeal dwelling is at 90 degrees to the adjacent terrace, the front of which, including No 207 Bedford Hill, contains habitable and non-habitable windows which directly face the side of the appeal property at very close range.
5. This proposal seeks to extend the property at first floor level to form a two-storey dwelling with a hipped roof. In terms of its front and rear elevations, the proposal would align with its neighbour No 191. Its fenestration and detailing would also reflect those of the neighbouring buildings.
6. Policy DMS1 of the Wandsworth Local Plan, Development Management Policies Document, 2016 (the 'DMPD') seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that developments do not harm the amenity of occupiers of nearby properties through unacceptable overbearing and an unsatisfactory outlook.

7. The existing outlook from habitable rooms of No 207 is directly towards the single-storey side elevation of the appeal dwelling with the two-storey flank elevation of No 191 beyond. I acknowledge that given the proximity of these buildings, the outlook from No.207 is already restricted, although the simple form and low height of No191a limits its impact.
8. The proposal would increase the height, bulk and massing of the property and would introduce significant additional built form at a high level, in closer proximity to habitable room windows of No 207 than the existing side wall of No 191. Consequently, it would appear considerably more overbearing than the existing structure when viewed from that property. Moreover, it would result in an increased sense of enclosure for occupiers.
9. I have taken into consideration the appellant's conclusions, based on calculations in a Daylight and Sunlight Study, that the proposal would not have a significant adverse effect on light received by the windows of neighbouring properties. Although there is no assessment made of the impact on daylight to the habitable rooms of No 207, the Council does not disagree. However, given the orientation of the properties it seems to me that the rooms facing the site are already likely to experience relatively low levels of natural light. For the above reasons the proposal would be overbearing and would cause further harm to the living conditions within those rooms.
10. Consequently, taking all the above into consideration, the proposed development would harm the living conditions of occupiers at No 207 Bedford Hill, with particular regard to visual impact and outlook. It would therefore conflict with policy DMS1 of the DMPD as set out above.

Other Matters

11. The appellant states that the proposal would significantly improve the existing living accommodation of the appeal dwelling. From all I have seen, it is currently a compact unit and I have no doubt that the proposal would provide more space and a more convenient access to the garden. However, I am unconvinced on the basis of the evidence before me that the existing dwelling does not provide an adequate standard of accommodation as it currently exists. This limits the weight I can give to the matter as a benefit of the scheme. As such, the benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hannah Ellison

Appeal Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

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

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR