



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2021

by **P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/21/3267082
111 Shuttleworth Road London SW11 3DL

- 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 Richard Scrope against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2020/4162, dated 20 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of roof extension above two storey back addition.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The updated National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on the 20 July 2021. I have referred to this where relevant.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance Three Sisters Conservation Area and setting of the Battersea Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The existing dwelling on the appeal site is a Victorian semi-detached cottage of brick elevations and tiled roof. It lies within a street scene of similar dwellings along the north side of the road; a modern three storey block of flats lies opposite. The appeal site is close to the junction with Bridge Lane and the upper rear part of the dwelling can be seen from this road. The area is predominantly residential in character though there are some commercial properties nearby, particularly in the nearby Battersea Bridge Road. The appeal site lies within the Three Sisters Conservation Area and within the setting of the adjoining Battersea Park Conservation Area.
5. The Three Sisters Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (AMS) notes that it is predominantly formed of pairs of semi-detached 'villas' and goes on to state that "*part of the special character of the area is the distinctive rhythm of hipped roofs and the gaps between each pair gives enhanced status to the houses; each pair appearing like a separate pavilion under a pyramidal roof. The hipped roofs also give emphasis to the gaps between buildings and as a consequence there is a feeling of spaciousness that is not apparent in the more commonplace terraced street arrangement*".

6. The proposal would involve the replacement of the hipped roof of the existing rear projection with a new mansard roof set behind a raised parapet edge. This parapet would be created by raising the existing walls to a height just above the eaves of the main dwelling. It would also involve the raising of the party wall by around 0.75 metre which currently only extends a small amount above the roof of the rear projection at the appeal property and the adjoining semi at no. 113.
7. In my opinion, this would result in an unsympathetic and awkward roof extension, adding considerable bulk to the rear of what is a relatively modest property, of a scale and design that is not in keeping with it. It would disrupt the distinctive roof form of the semi-detached pair and would be harmful to the contribution that it makes to the character of the area as identified above.
8. I note that roof extensions have already taken place at other properties within the group along Shuttleworth Road and one of these can be seen from Bridge Lane. Whilst similar to that proposed, I consider that it appears as an unsympathetic addition given its design and bulk; in any event, such roof extensions have not diluted the overall character of this part of the conservation area or the contribution that the original roof forms identified in the AMS make to it. As such I do not consider that it justifies the appeal proposal, particularly given the prominent location of the appeal site.
9. In addition, when viewed from Bridge Lane, the raised party wall would appear as an awkward roof addition to the roof form of the semi-detached pair. Whilst this party wall would screen much of the bulk of the roof addition in views from Bridge Lane, part of which is within the adjoining Battersea Park Conservation Area, the rear part of it would still be visible and in my view would be a detracting feature in the street scene.
10. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Three Sisters Conservation Area and would be harmful to the setting of the adjoining Battersea Park Conservation Area. It would thus conflict with Policies DMS1, DMS2 and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2016) which seek high quality sustainable design, that ensures the conservation and where appropriate, enhancement of the significance, appearance and character of heritage assets and the surrounding historic environment, and which considers features that contribute to appearance and character. The proposal would also conflict with the AMS and the guidance in the Housing SPD for the reasons set out above.
11. In respect of the Framework, I find that the proposal would result in a less than substantial level of harm. Paragraph 202 states that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the development. The proposal would provide enhanced living accommodation for the current occupants and improvements to the property. However, these are not of sufficient public benefit to outweigh the harm in this instance.

Conclusions

12. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR