



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2020

by Christopher Miell MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/20/3248106 2-4 Wiseton Road, London SW17 7EE

- 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 and Mrs Adams against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2019/4536, dated 18 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is creation of a traditional mansard roof across the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for creation of a traditional mansard roof across the property at 2-4 Wiseton Road, London SW17 7EE in accordance with the terms of application, Ref: 2019/4536, dated 18 October 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:
 - 505 PL(0)001 – Existing Site Plan
 - 505 PL(0)110 – Proposed Front Elevation Section
 - 505 PL(0)111 – Proposed Rear Elevation
 - 505 PL(0)121 – Proposed Section AA
 - 505 PL(0)103 Rev A – Proposed Second Floor Plan
 - 505 PL(0)104 Rev A – Roof Plan: Proposed Second Floor Plan
 - 3) Prior to the erection of the mansard roof extension, full details of all external facing materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The relevant works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matters

2. I have been appointed to determine two appeals on this site. The other appeal reference is APP/H5960/D/20/3248111. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits and prepared separate decision letters.

3. On my site visit, I observed that there was a dead animal on the first-floor landing, which appeared to be a bat. Furthermore, I noted that there were a significant number of insect carcasses within the loft room of the building. The main parties were notified about my observations and given an opportunity to address this matter as part of the appeal process. The appellants undertook further investigations and concluded that the dead animal was a bird. In addition, the Council advised that data from the Local Environment Record Centre for London ('LERC') showed that there was no recent record of bats at the appeal site or within the immediate vicinity. Based on the evidence before me, I am satisfied that it has been established that the appeal property is unlikely to be occupied by bats. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
4. As part of the appeal, the appellants have submitted several computer-generated images of the proposed development. As the submitted documents do not evolve the scheme, and the nature of the concerns of those who would normally have been consulted are clear from consultation on the original set of plans, I do not consider that their interests would be prejudiced if I determine the appeal in accordance with these documents.
5. The applicant name is not specified on the planning application form. However, the appellant details are stated as Mr and Mrs Smith on the appeal form. In the interests of clarity and precision, I have used the appellant name, as stated in Section A of the appeal form, in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area.

Reasons

7. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area (the 'CA').
8. The CA covers an extensive part of the Borough and it has been broken down into several sub-areas by the Council. The appeal site is located within 'Sub Area H – St James'. The Council's Wandsworth Common Conservation Area Appraisal: Sub Area H – St James explains that the special appeal of this area is due to the mix of richly expressed yet individually styled properties, with generous front gardens, coupled with the expanse of the Common. Properties are grouped in a variety of ways forming unified terraces, detached and semi-detached properties.
9. The parties explain that the appeal property dates from the Victorian period and was originally constructed as two separate terraced dwellings, which were later converted into one dwelling. The building has a brick exterior under a gabled roof form. The original party wall has been partially retained and projects above the roofline.
10. It is proposed to demolish the existing gable roof form and construct a mansard roof extension, which would span the entire width of the appeal property. The mansard roof would be set behind a parapet wall and would include dormer windows to the front and rear.

11. The appeal site is located on the western side of Wiseton Road, near to the junction with Bellevue Road. The existing properties on this side of the road date from a range of architectural periods and a variety of building styles are present along the street, which includes modern three storey flat roof developments interspersed amongst the historic properties. In addition, the terraced dwelling located immediately to the side of the appeal property, known as No 6 Wiseton Road, features a mansard roof extension above the original Victorian building.
12. Consequently, the existing buildings on this side of Wiseton Road are not part of a cohesive group and do not form a unified terrace. Nevertheless, the use of common materials, such as brick and render, results in a design balance and symmetry which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
13. Whilst I recognise that the proposal would result in the loss of the host building's existing gable roof form, the proposed development would respond to the aforementioned site context in an appropriate manner and align with the height of the existing mansard roof at No 6.
14. The Council argue that the raised party walls to the side of mansard roofs are highly visible when viewed from the street and they often detract from the character and appearance of the CA. However, in this instance, the proposal would result in a uniform roofline from Nos 2-6 Wiseton Road and it would partially obscure existing views of the raised party wall of No 6. Moreover, the side elevation of the proposed mansard roof would face the three storey flank elevation of the neighbouring property, and, in this context, would not be a prominent feature within the local roofscape.
15. In addition to the above, the proposed extension would be of a high-quality design and would be constructed from materials that would be in-keeping with the host building and local vernacular. Moreover, the rhythm, spacing and curved design of the dormer windows on the front elevation would be well related to the existing first floor windows, whilst the reinstatement of the party wall above the roofline would retain the appearance of two separate dwellings at the appeal site. Therefore, the proposal would not dominate or compete with the architectural integrity of the host building.
16. For these reasons, the proposal would not appear as a visually intrusive form of development when viewed from the street. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would have a neutral impact upon and thus preserve the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.
17. As such, the proposal would accord with Policy DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan: Development Management Policies Document (the 'DPD') which states that development will be permitted where it is well designed and does not dominate or compete with the original building. Moreover it would accord with Criterion (ii) of Policy DMH5 which states where a roof alteration/extension would be visible from the street or any other public place, it should be sympathetic to the style of the building, not visually intrusive and avoid harm to either the street scene or the building's appearance.
18. Furthermore, the proposal would accord with Policies DMS1 and DMS2 of the DPD and Policies PL1 and IS3 of the Wandsworth Local Plan: Core Strategy which require new development to be of a high quality and to protect and

reinforce the existing varied character, appearance and heritage of the Borough, whilst ensuring that proposals sustain, conserve, and where appropriate, enhance the significance of the Borough's heritage assets.

19. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposal would conflict with the design guidance for roof alterations contained within the Council's Housing Supplementary Planning Document (the 'Housing SPD'), these standards are only guidance and are an indicator of what is likely to be acceptable. In this instance, I have assessed the proposal on its own individual planning merits and found it to be acceptable. As such, a failure to adhere to the standards in the Housing SPD is not sufficient in itself to dismiss the appeal.

Other Matters

20. In determining the application, the Council concluded that the proposal would not result in any significant detrimental impacts upon the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in respect of outlook, privacy and daylight and sunlight. Based on the evidence before me, which includes my site observations, I have no reason to disagree with the Council's assessment.

Conditions

21. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three-year time limit condition. It is necessary that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary to impose a condition relating to materials. Due to the lack of precise detailing, that being the omission of proposed side elevations, it is necessary for the materials to be agreed prior to the erection of the mansard roof extension.
22. The Council have recommended a condition which would require the appellants to undertake a bat survey of the property. Given that further investigations undertaken by the appellants did not identify bats at the property, and, taking account of the Council's submissions in respect of the LERC data, I consider that this condition is not necessary. Nevertheless, if bats are discovered after development has started, Government guidance¹ advises that the appellant should stop all work and seek expert help from a qualified and licensed ecologist. Then conduct a survey and develop mitigation plans.
23. Neighbouring residents argue that a condition should be imposed requiring a Construction Method Statement to be agreed with the Council and the development constructed accordingly. However, such a condition has not been recommended by the Council. Given the minor nature of the proposal, the imposition of such a planning condition would be unreasonable.

Conclusion

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

Christopher Miell
INSPECTOR

¹ HM Government – Bats: surveys and mitigation for development projects (March 2015)