



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2020

by M Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/20/3253209

8 Lavenham Road, London SW18 5HA

- 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 Marina and Tim Calland against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2020/0229, dated 21 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is alterations including erection of mansard roof extension to main rear roof (with french doors and safety railings) and erection of part single, part two storey rear/side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations including erection of mansard roof extension to main rear roof (with french doors and safety railings) and erection of part single, part two storey rear/side extension at 8 Lavenham Road, London SW18 5HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2020/0229, dated 21 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:
Drawing Numbers 1810.B3.G20.P10 Rev B, 1810.B3.G20.P00 Rev B, 1810.B3.G20.P01 Rev B, 1810.B3.G20.P02 Rev A, 1810.B3.G20.P03 Rev A, 1810.B3.G20.S01 Rev A, 1810.B3.G20.E01 Rev B, 1810.B3.G20.E02 Rev A, 1810.B5.G20.P00 Rev C, 1810.B5.G20.P01 Rev B, 1810.B5.G20.P02 Rev C, 1810.B5.G20.P03 Rev C, 1810.B5.G20.S01 Rev A, 1810.B5.G20.E01 Rev D and 1810.B5.G20.E02 Rev A.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from Part E of the appeal form, where it is stated that the description of development has not changed from that on the planning application form but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. The description given within the appeal

form accurately reflects the proposal and I have therefore used this within my decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the (i) character and appearance of the area and (ii) living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining properties, with particular regard to overbearing effect and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The increase in the height of the rear extension, in order to create the first floor, would be visible from public vantage points along Elsenham Road. However, the extension would be viewed against the backdrop of the rear elevations of the existing dwellings in the terrace and, given its setback from Elsenham Road, would not be viewed as an overly dominant feature.
5. I acknowledge that there are no other first floor extensions along this terrace, however it does not follow that this of itself results in the scheme being unacceptable. The extension would be a subservient element, with its height terminating below the level of the chimney stack. Whilst the construction of the extension would result in a loss of symmetry to the rear elevation, I observed that there was some variety in the design of other extensions within the area, which included flat roof and lean-to additions, and as such the proposal would further add to this variety and as a consequence, it would not have an awkward appearance.
6. The Council accept that the principle of the rear roof extension has previously been established and as such concern stems from the proposed dormer windows. I accept that one of the proposed dormers would be larger in scale than the windows to the first floor below, however both dormers would be set in from the sides of the proposed extension as well as set down from the highest point. As a result, they would appear as subservient elements and would not dominate the rear roofscape. Their positioning would also ensure that they would not appear as awkward visual elements. Neither would they make the roof extension appear top heavy. My view in this respect is reinforced by the presence of other similarly designed roof extensions on nearby properties.
7. Therefore, the character and appearance of the area would not be harmed and the development would comply with policies DMS 1 and DMH 5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan – Development Management Policies Document (2016) (the Local Plan), which seek to ensure that development provides high quality design and that extensions are not visually intrusive. I acknowledge the conflict with the Council's Housing Supplementary Planning Document, however for the reasons above I find that there would be no harmful effect and thus there is good reason for departing from this general advice.
8. It has been contended that should the proposals be approved they would set an undesirable precedent for further development within the terrace. However, as I have found that the scheme would not be harmful, I find nothing to suggest that an undesirable precedent would result.

Living conditions

9. The extension would result in the increase in height of the existing single storey extension, in order to accommodate an additional level of accommodation above. However, whilst there would be an increase in the built form at first floor level and the extension would be clearly visible from adjoining garden areas, given that it would be viewed within the context of the existing property and be located within an area with a densely packed urban grain, the additional massing would not be such that it would result in an overbearing impact on neighbouring occupiers, nor would it result in any unacceptable sense of enclosure.
10. The first floor of the extension would not protrude beyond the rear elevation further than the existing single storey element, nor beyond the single storey element of the adjacent property. As a consequence, whilst it would be visible from neighbouring properties, its visual appearance would not be of such a degree as to result in an unacceptable outlook from any neighbouring windows.
11. Accordingly, there would be no harm to the living conditions of adjoining properties, with particular regard to overbearing effect and outlook, and the development would comply with policy DMS 1 of the Local Plan, insofar as it seeks to ensure development does not harm the amenity of nearby occupiers.

Conditions

12. In addition to ensuring adherence to the approved plans, a condition securing the use of matching materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, and subject to the conditions as set out, the appeal is allowed.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR