

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2020

by Patrick Hanna MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22/09/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/20/3249447

62 Honeywell Road, London SW11 6EF

- 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 Sean O’Sullivan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2019/5159, dated 27 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is to make use of the existing roof space by forming a small roof terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for use of the existing roof space by forming a roof terrace at 62 Honeywell Road, London SW11 6EF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2019/5159, dated 27 November 2019, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matters

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Sean O’Sullivan against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.
3. The application was determined by the Council without a roof plan to show the layout of the proposed roof terrace. Whilst the appellant states that this drawing formed part of the application package, it has not been subject to the necessary and appropriate consultation. Nonetheless, I agree with the Council that the elevational and other drawings before me are sufficient to reach a determination on the appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, with particular regard to size and siting.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a flat-roofed, three-storey, end-of-terrace dwellinghouse of contemporary design, attached to the western end of a two-storey terrace of Victorian dwellings. Whilst the ground slopes down to the west, the buildings are of similar overall height. The effect of the proposal would be to install glazing and a truncated flank wall to create a roof terrace, set back from the front and side façades, and of similar height to the adjacent chimney stack.

6. From the front, the set back from the front roof edge would position the proposed glazing and planters as far back as the centre point of the adjacent existing chimney, thereby ensuring that this aspect of the proposal would not be visible. Even from the higher ground to the east, my observations are that views would be limited, with the existing chimney stack obscuring most of the proposal. From the west, the appeal dwelling currently presents an imposing and dominant three-storey blank white façade for the full depth of the dwelling. Again, the set back from this façade, combined with the change in ground level, would ensure that the glazing and planters would appear recessive and subservient.
7. The proposed flank wall would be seen from either direction, however the additional height proposed is modest enough to ensure that views would be limited and, even so, it would read as an integral part of the design of the existing projecting fin wall, particularly given the set back. From adjacent rear properties, vantage points giving visibility of the proposed rear glazing panel would be restricted by the existing extensions at the appeal site and at No 64 Honeywell Road and would, in any case, be seen in the context of a variety of rear extension designs.
8. Overall, the size and siting of the proposal is such that only a small part of it would be seen, and then only from limited vantage points, such that the increase in height would not be out of keeping with the adjacent building heights. Furthermore, the elements of the proposal that would be seen would be sympathetic to the contemporary design features of the existing dwelling, which is unique in its context, even if the proposed planting was not maintained.
9. Although permitted development rights were removed at the appeal site following grant of planning permission in 2000, the current proposal does not offend policy or cause harm. Furthermore, given this lack of harm, I do not need to consider any fallback position that may derive from the recent amendment of Class AA to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015, which sets out permitted development rights for construction of up to two additional storeys on an existing dwelling. Objections have been raised regarding the visual impact of potential future handrails and enlargement of the terrace, however these do not form part of the current appeal proposal.
10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, with particular regard to size and siting. Accordingly, the proposal complies with policies DMS1 and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Development Management Policies Document (2016) and the Wandsworth Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2016).

Other matters

11. Any casual overlooking from the terrace to neighbouring properties to the rear would be addressed by the use of obscured glazing. To look directly at these properties, occupants would have to purposely lean over the glazing, not a position most people would naturally take. Properties opposite the appeal site would be no more overlooked than existing. The potential for noise to be generated by use of the terrace would be limited, given the small area proposed, and notwithstanding any commitments made by the appellants.

Conditions and conclusion

12. A condition detailing the approved plans is required for certainty. A condition requiring further details of obscured glazing is necessary to protect living conditions. To maintain the character and appearance of the host building, a condition in respect of matching materials is also necessary.
13. For the reasons given, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Patrick Hanna

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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: 1814/P/101 (Proposed Front Elevation); 1814/P/102 (Proposed Rear Elevation); 1814/P/103 (Proposed Flank Elevation); 1814/P/104 (Proposed Section E); 1814/P/105 (Proposed Section B); 1814/P/106 (Proposed Street View); and 1814/P/107 (Proposed Street View), all dated 27 November 2019.
- 3) The roof terrace hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the terrace has been fitted with obscured glazing. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the glazing is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.
- 4) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials to match those used in the existing building.