The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/20/3254417
106 Ramsden Road, London SW12 8RB

- 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 Amanda Hagon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
- The application Ref 2020/0325, dated 28 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2020.
- The proposed development is alterations including erection of roof extension to side and rear of main rear roof and above two-storey back addition.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations including erection of roof extension to side and rear of main rear roof and above two-storey back addition at 106 Ramsden Road, London SW12 8RB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2020/0325, dated 28 January 2020, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

    2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

    3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 17-019-OS1, 17-019-P01, 17-019-P02, 17-019-P03, 17-019-P04 and 17-019-P05.

    4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the side-facing windows as shown on the proposed second-floor plan on drawing no. 17-019-P03 have been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which they are installed shall be capable of being opened. Once installed, the obscured glazing shall be retained as such thereafter.

    5) The front roof light hereby permitted shall be installed to be flush with the existing roof slope of the host dwelling.

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.

Procedural Matters

3. As confirmed in the appeal form, the appellant and the Council agreed to change the description of the proposed development during the course of the application. This amended description is included in the decision notice, and I have therefore included it within the banner heading and decision above.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Nightingale Lane Conservation Area (NLCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is situated within the NLCA. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that with respect to development affecting buildings or other land in a conservation area, "special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area." The Nightingale Lane Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy sets out that the special interest of the NLCA is largely derived from its picturesque setting, diverse townscape, and tree-lined streets.

6. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey dwelling on the eastern side of Ramsden Road. It forms part of a small terrace of three dwellings which are primarily characterised by their yellow stock brick materiality, similar detailing and ground-floor bay windows. When viewed from the street, the terrace has a visually uniform appearance which is typical of other terraces and semi-detached pairs within the immediate area. However, during my site visit I observed from the rear garden of the appeal site that neighbouring properties had been subject to large rear extensions of varying form and design.

7. The appeal property and No 102, which forms the other end of this terrace, both have hipped roofs. Like several properties along Ramsden Road, a dormer is set within the side roofslope of No 102. However, due to its scale and design it appears as a relatively small addition and, as it is set back from the front roofslope, it preserves both the original hipped roof form of the host property and the uniform appearance of the terrace. In comparison, the proposed side roof extension would span across most of the side roofslope and connect with the proposed extension over the rear outrigger. Although the scale of the proposed side roof extension would be relatively greater than the dormer at No 102, it would also be stepped back from the front roofslope and so would preserve the appearance of the original hipped roof form, as well as the visual cohesion of the terrace. Furthermore, as views of this element of the proposal from Ramsden Road would be largely obscured by a street tree situated on the pavement in front of the appeal site, as well as the height and bulk of No 108 which is sited in close proximity to the north, the proposal would not appear overly prominent within public views. Overall the character and appearance of the site, streetscene and NLCA would be preserved.

8. While the proposed roof extension over the rear outrigger would feature an asymmetrical, dual-pitched roof form, this element would be positioned to the rear of the site away from public views, and would not appear particularly incongruous within private views given the variety of large rear extensions within the surrounding context. For the same reasons, the size and scale of the rear mansard roof extension over the main roof would also be acceptable. I therefore consider that this part of the proposed development would also preserve the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, as well as the significance of the NLCA.

9. The use of GRP roofing was considered to be acceptable by the Council in their determination of the scheme approved under application Ref 2018/4349 and I consider that it would also be acceptable as part of this proposal. Furthermore, as the uPVC windows would be sited away from public views and would not appear prominent within private views, the proposal would also be acceptable in this regard.

10. As such, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the NLCA. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies DMS1 and DMS2 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies Document 2016 (the DMPD) which respectively state that development should contribute to local spatial character and preserve the significance, appearance, character and setting of heritage assets. The proposal would also comply with Policy DMH5 of the DMPD, which states that alterations and extensions to existing residential properties must be well-designed.

11. The proposal would also comply with Section 72(1) of the Act, as set out above.

12. The proposal would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the NPPF), which states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset.

13. The proposal would also comply with the Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2016 which, amongst other things, states that hipped roof forms on end-of-terraced houses are often characteristic features of conservation areas and must always be retained.

Conditions

14. The conditions which are imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council, but with some variation in the interest of clarity and precision having regard to the advice on imposing conditions in the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance.

15. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the scheme be built in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt. In the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the appeal property, streetscene and NLCA, I have attached a condition requiring that the materials to be used for the external surfaces shall match those of the existing building. For the same reason, I have also attached a condition requiring that the front roof light be flush with the front roofslope similar to that in the extant planning permission and as suggested by the Council in their officer report.

16. Having had regard to the privacy of neighbouring occupants, I have found it necessary to attach a condition requiring that side-facing windows at second-floor level should be obscure glazed and should not be fully openable.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR