



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2021

by **S Dean MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/20/3263050

10 & 12 Redgrave Road, London, SW15 1PX

- 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 Alan Bowling against the decision of London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2020/2086, dated 1 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of matching hip to gable roof extension with 300mm raised ridge, rear mansard with traditional dormer window, along with balanced alterations to both outriggers with flat sided dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of matching hip to gable roof extension with 300mm raised ridge, rear mansard with traditional dormer window, along with balanced alterations to both outriggers with flat sided dormers. at 10 & 12 Redgrave Road, London, SW15 1PX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2020/2086, dated 1 July 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 shall be carried out in accordance with following drawings; P.01, P.02, P.03, P.04A, P.05B, P.06A, P.07A, P.08A, P.20, 2001-PL-130, 2001-PL.301, 2001-PL.302, 2001-PL.303, 2001-PL-304A, 2001-PL-305, 2001-PL-310, 2001-PL311, 2001-PL-330.
 - 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 and shall be retained permanently.
 - 4) The roof area of the development hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area and furthermore, no balustrades, railings or other means of enclosure or means of permanent access shall be erected on this area.

Preliminary Matter

2. The London Plan 2021 has been published by the Mayor, setting the spatial development strategy for London and is now part of the development plan. The decision notice for the appeal application referred to the London Plan 2019, but only in terms which have not changed with the publication of the London Plan 2021. The Council Officer Report and appellant Statement of Case are clear that policies in the Wandsworth Development Management Policies Document 2016 are the most relevant for this appeal. As such, I have not found it necessary to seek the views of the parties on the London Plan 2021.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a pair of semi-detached properties, under a hipped roof in a street of varied character and appearance, with a mixture of terraced and semi-detached houses, hipped and gabled roof forms, various ridge heights, and various approaches to dormer windows and roof lights. To the rear, the site, the street, and the immediate surroundings also very varied, with alterations having a rich and wide variety of form, materials, massing and design detailing. The appeal site is already noticeably different within the street, with a lower ridge height and different (post-war) roofing materials, yet more elaborately detailed front elevation than its neighbours.
5. The site lies within the Charlwood Road and Lifford Street Conservation Area (the CA). The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy notes that this urban area is largely made up of late nineteenth century semi-detached and terraced housing, generally in brick under slate roofs, set around a fine network of streets providing a sense of enclosure and uniformity of scale. Due to its incongruous roof material, the appeal site makes a negative contribution to the significance of the CA, and is explicitly highlighted as being different to its neighbours and having features which detract from the CA.
6. Although increasing the ridge height slightly, the appeal proposal would still be lower in height than neighbouring properties and would retain its elaborately detailed front elevation and decoration. It would still therefore appear markedly different to its neighbours. However, through the use of a slate roof, the proposal would reintroduce more appropriate materials to the site and the area. Owing to the mixture of roof forms around it, the use of a gable roof would be entirely appropriate, and the end elevation profile would not appear unusual in the street. I also do not find that the visibility of the proposals, including fleeting glimpses of the rear, or clearer views of the end elevation, which are not fundamentally different to the wider street and area, would be harmful as a result of their visibility. The rear extensions, including the overall reshaping of the roof and the dormer would not be unusual or particularly incongruous, particularly in light of their size relative to the host and the wide variety of form, scale, design and detailing of rear extensions along Redgrave Road. Whilst I note the hipped roof form would be lost, given the preservation of a difference in scale, mass and detail between the site and its surroundings, I do not find this harmful or otherwise unacceptable.

7. Having given great weight to the conservation of the of the CA as a heritage asset, I consider that the proposal would therefore make a positive contribution to its significance as a heritage asset, and would enhance the character and appearance of the CA.
8. I therefore find that the character and appearance of the proposal would be acceptable. The design, bulk and siting would not cause any visual harm to the character and appearance of the host properties, nor would it be visually intrusive or harmful to the significance of the CA as a heritage asset.
9. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies DMS1, DMS2 and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document, March 2016, which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development is of high quality design, appropriate to the scale, massing and appearance of its context, contributes positively to local character, sustains, conserves and enhances heritage assts, and that roof alterations in particular are sympathetic to the style of the host dwelling and area, are not visually intrusive or over-dominant. The proposal would also comply with guidance in the Wandsworth Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document, Housing, November 2016 (the SPD), which seeks to elaborate on the development plan policies, notes the importance of roof form to the character and appearance of a CA and seeks to ensure that development contributes to a good quality environment. In particular, I find the appeal proposal to be one of the few occasions, implicit in the SPD, in which changing a hipped roof to a gable in a CA does not cause harm to its character, appearance or significance. The proposal would also therefore comply with guidance in the Framework on good design and on conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Conditions

10. Having had regard to the requirements of the Framework, the Planning Practice Guidance and the comments of the Council, I have imposed standard conditions concerning commencement (1), compliance with the submitted plans (2) and requiring the use of matching materials (3) and in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the completed development. I have also imposed a condition (4) controlling the future use of the roof area, to protect the amenity of occupiers of adjoining properties from and noise and disturbance which may arise from its use. I am satisfied that the conditions meet the tests in, and requirements of both the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal accords with the development plan and there are no material considerations which indicate that a decision be taken other than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be allowed, and planning permission granted.

S Dean

INSPECTOR