



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2019

by Adrian Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/19/3237161

5 St Anthonys Close, London SW17 7UD

- 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 Patrick Dowling against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2019/1857, dated 26 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of two dormers to front roofslope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of two dormers to front roofslope at 5 St Anthonys Close, London SW17 7UD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2019/1857, dated 26 April 2019, 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: EG-001/2018.09.28.PJD; EG-008/2018.09.28.PJD & EG-009/2018.09.28.PJD.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dormers shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. St Anthonys Close is a small residential cul de sac within a modern housing estate of mostly semi-detached and terraced two-storey properties. The appeal building presents a simple two-storey frontage onto the cul de sac. Other properties back onto the cul de sac and have large box dormers covering the majority of their rear roof slopes.
4. Policy DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2016) (LP) requires extensions to be well designed and not so large that they dominate the original building. In respect of dormer windows, they should be confined to the rear, but where visible from the street or other public place, they should be sympathetic to the style of the building, not visually

intrusive and not harmful to either the street scene or appearance of the building. The Supplementary Planning Document: Housing (2016) also cautions against front dormers and generally requires the scale and location of dormers to be carefully considered to avoid the house looking top heavy.

5. Even though the proposed dormers would be located on the front roofslope they would be well-proportioned, subordinate elements, set comfortably away from the ridge and edges of the roof, as well as from each other. They would also be neatly aligned with the windows beneath and have pitched roofs to complement the character of the existing building. As such, they would not appear bulky or dominant on the roofslope and in turn, would not result in the house looking top heavy.
6. Furthermore, in a relatively contained inward-focused context where other much larger dormers are present, the proposed dormers could not be considered an incongruous addition. I acknowledge that the other dormers may have been constructed under permitted development. Nonetheless, they influence the character of this cul de sac, and the proposed dormers would be designed to a much higher quality.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. It therefore accords in this regard to LP Policy DMH5 and the Housing SPD, as set out above.

Conditions

8. I have imposed the standard time limit condition as well as a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. These are considered necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance, I have also included a condition requiring the external materials of the dormers to match the dwelling.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Adrian Caines

INSPECTOR