
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2020

by Rory MacLeod BA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/20/3250621

Byron, 51-53 Northcote Road, London SW11 1NJ

- 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 Steve Adkins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2020/0376, dated 28 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is creation of a third floor mansard extension to accommodate a two-bedroom flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for creation of a third floor mansard extension to accommodate a two-bedroom flat at Byron, 51-53 Northcote Road, London SW11 1NJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2020/0376, dated 28 January 2020, 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: P/600, P/601, P/602, P/603, P/604, P/605/A, P/606, P/607, P/608/A, P/609/A, P/610 and P/611.
 - 3) All external materials used in the construction of the development hereby approved shall match the type, texture, tone, colour, size and profile of those used on the existing building.
 - 4) Prior to the commencement of above ground works (excluding demolition), details of the siting, design and materials of refuse and recycling storage to serve the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The refuse storage facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation of the development and shall be retained thereafter.
 - 5) The development shall achieve a maximum water use of 105 litres per person per day (plus 5 litres for outside use) in line with the Water Efficiency Calculator for new dwellings from the Department of Communities and Local Government. Prior to first occupation, evidence to demonstrate that the internal water consumption of the development will not exceed 105l/p/day must be submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing. Measures integrated shall be retained for the lifetime of the development.

Preliminary Matter

2. Planning permission has been granted after submission of the appeal for alterations including the erection of a mansard roof extension to the front and rear roof of No.51 and a rear dormer to No.53 in connection with creation of a one-bedroom flat. The external works to No.51 resemble those in the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue therefore is the effect of the roof alteration to No.53 on the character and appearance of the property and street scene in respect of its design, siting and mass.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end of terrace building comprising a restaurant with two floors of residential accommodation over. It is located on the eastern side of Northcote Road to the north of its junction with Shelgate Road. There are three storey buildings to the other three corners of this crossroads, all of which like the appeal site currently present a shallow hipped pitched roof. The proposal would continue the line and detailing of the mansard roof over Nos. 47-49 Northcote Road but would contrast with the hipped roofs to other corners.
5. In my judgement, the proposal would relate more strongly to the terrace of which it is a part than to the other corners. The roof form would be perceived as part of a uniform design feature extending over four properties. It would not be out of keeping with the rest of the terrace which has a diverse character with buildings ranging in height from two to four storeys. Its height would not seem excessive in relation to the two and four storey buildings on rising land along the return frontage in Shelgate Road. It would not appear incongruous as it would relate to a matching roof form on adjacent buildings. The proposal would not be unduly prominent as in long views it would be seen against roof forms of comparable height and mass in the same terrace, and in closer views the existing eaves line would remain a stronger feature in the street scene.
6. The other terraces which form the crossroads are not of consistent character notwithstanding the hipped roofs. The terraces to the south of Shelgate Road have more uniform roof lines whereas the terrace opposite, on the western side of Northgate Road, has a varied roof form. There are contrasts between all four terraces in relation to external materials, fenestration and chimneys. The loss of the hipped roof to the appeal building would not therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the property or to the Northcote Road street scene.
7. The proposal would not be contrary to Policy PL1 of the Wandsworth Core Strategy (2016) a general policy which states that local distinctiveness of the various neighbourhoods will be promoted. It would accord with Policies DMS1 of the Development Management Policies Document (2016) (DMP) which requires the scale, massing and appearance of development to provide a high quality design and layout that contributes positively to local spatial character. Whilst the proposal would not be restricted to a rear roof slope, as advocated by Policy DMH5 of the DMP, it would not be inconsistent with the policy's wider aims. Although the proposal would be visible from the street, it would be sympathetic to the style of the building, would not be visually intrusive and would not harm either the street scene or the building's appearance.

8. There would not be material conflict with paragraph 4.156 of the Housing SPD in relation to buildings on corner sites; the text to the guidance relates more to houses than to mixed use terraces. The proposal would accord with paragraph 4.157 in that it would be sensitively designed and detailed to ensure no harm to an attractive street scene.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the building or surrounding area in respect to its design, siting and mass. For the reasons given the appeal is allowed subject to conditions.
10. In addition to the standard 3 year commencement condition, I have included a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty and to enable the approval of minor material amendments should this be expedient. To ensure a satisfactory appearance a condition is needed to ensure the use of matching external materials. The provision of appropriate refuse and recycling storage needs to be secured by a condition, and in the interests of sustainability the Council's suggested condition to control water use is necessary. However, given the highly accessible and sustainable location I do not consider the Council's suggested condition on cycle storage to be necessary; moreover, its inclusion would be inconsistent with analysis in the Council's delegated report on this issue.

Rory MacLeod

INSPECTOR