



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 10 August 2021

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/20/3248666

14 Borrodaile Road, London SW18 2LL

- 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 Fabio Digreggio against the decision of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2020/0232, dated 22 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2020.
 - The development is for a dormer to the rear roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.
3. At the time of the site visit I noted that the dormer window has been completed. The application has been submitted retrospectively and I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a relatively modern two storey dwelling located within a residential road. This side of the road is characterised by modestly sized dwellings in a staggered arrangement at an angle to the road. The majority of properties are devoid of roof extensions although No.7 benefits from a two-storey side extension and rear dormer window. The scale, form and architecture of properties in the wider area varies considerably.
6. I acknowledge the use of sympathetic materials and that the development's window aligns with the ones below. However, the dormer window is only set down from the ridge by a small amount and occupies almost the entire roof. The dormer window due to its height, width and design results in an unduly

large and bulky feature dominating the roof slope and harming the appearance of the host property.

7. Although views of the development when approaching from St. Ann's Hill are glimpsed, largely screened by existing trees, it is clearly visible from a small section of the road and a number of neighbouring properties and their gardens appearing as an unduly incongruous feature on account of its bulk.
8. I conclude that the development unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the host property and the area contrary to Policies DMS1 and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2016) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of a development provides a high quality sustainable design and dormer windows to be sympathetic to the style of the building and not harm either the street scene or the building's appearance.

Other Matters

9. The support of neighbours counts neither for nor against the proposal. The development does not unacceptably affect light or privacy and is not an overbearing structure. However, these factors either individually or cumulatively do not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.
10. The appellant has referred to permitted development rights relating to dormer windows. However, there is nothing to suggest that this is an option or that such a scheme would be similar to what has been built. As such, I give that argument limited weight in coming to my decision.
11. My attention has been drawn to other roof alterations in the area including at No.7. However, the circumstances behind each development is likely to be different. In any event, every appeal must be considered on its own merits, as I have done in this case. The presence of other roof extensions and extended properties in the area is not a reason to allow unacceptable development.
12. I acknowledge that areas change over time, but it is important that they do so in a manner appropriate to their character. In this particular regard I have found that the development is not.
13. I have given the appellant's personal situation careful consideration. However, I am mindful of the advice contained in the Planning Practice Guidance that in general, planning is concerned with land use in the public interest. For this reason, I find that this factor is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.
14. The amendments suggested by the Council and the potential resultant internal conditions is not a matter for me in this appeal.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above the appeal does not succeed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR