



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2021 by C Glaister BSc (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip RTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/21/3280404

37 Isis Street, London SW18 3QL

- 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 Waad Darzi (of WD Architecture) against the decision of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2021/0796, dated 18 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of an extension to the existing mansard roof addition and alterations at the ground level consisting of additional rooflights and a sliding door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of an extension to the existing mansard roof addition and alterations at the ground level consisting of additional rooflights and a sliding door at 37 Isis Street, London SW18 3QL in accordance with the terms of application Ref 2021/0796, dated 18 February 2021 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: A0001 (12/05/20), A1002 (dated 11/30/20), A1004 (11/30/20), A2002 (dated 11/30/20), A3002 (dated 11/27/20), A3004 (dated 11/30/20).
 - 3) 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.

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. The Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 20 July 2021. Regard has been had to the revised national policy as a material consideration in the decision-making process. However, in this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal

remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. There is therefore no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework.

4. The Council have raised no issue with the alterations at ground-floor level. These are minor alterations that would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, or the surrounding area. The recommendation will therefore focus on the roof extension.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The site is a mid-terrace property with a modest garden. To its rear are the gardens and rear elevations of another residential terrace. The original pitched-roof outrigger of No 37 mirrors and adjoins the outrigger of 35 Isis Street. No 37 maintains a small extension above its outrigger. The extension above the outrigger of No 35 is larger and extends close to the full depth of the outrigger. The extension at No 35 is very similar to what is proposed at No 37. There are other instances of extensions along Isis Street which maintain a vertical rear projection. The proposal would not be visible from the street.
7. The development would extend the existing roof extension close to the full depth of the outrigger, such that it would meet and mirror the development at No 35. The development would in this way promote symmetry between the rear elevations of both dwellings, and remain sympathetic to the design and appearance of other extensions along Isis Street.
8. The Supplementary Planning Document Housing (SPD) suggests that development which extends over the full length of the back addition may not be allowed in the interests of avoiding harm to neighbouring amenities. This appears to relate to living conditions, which is not an issue raised in this appeal. However, the development would in any case accord with this aspect of the SPD under the broadest definition of amenity, including where it relates to visual impact. The SPD also suggests that extensions which extend between raised party walls should slope back at 70 degrees. However, given the site-specific circumstances of the proposal, particularly how it would relate to the adjoining development at No 35, the extension would be acceptable.
9. For these reasons, the development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, or the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policy IS 3 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Core Strategy (March 2016), and Policies DMS 1 and DMH 5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (March 2016) which together seek to ensure development is visually attractive, well designed, not so large that it dominates and competes with the original building, and achieves a high level of physical integration with its surroundings. It would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

10. Standard conditions relating to the commencement of the development and compliance with the plans, in order to provide certainty, are recommended. A

condition ensuring the external materials match the existing building would be necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. A condition to limit the future addition of openings in the east elevation is not necessary. Given this is a side elevation this is adequately controlled by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposal is therefore seen to conform with the development plan as a whole. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

C Glaister

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR