



---

# Appeal Decision

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

**Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 30 November 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/21/3277318**

**112 Merton Road, London SW18 5SR**

- 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 Mrs Nadine Mahony against the decision of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
  - The application Ref 2021/0313, dated 25 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2021.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a mansard roof extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## 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. A number of revised plans were been provided as part of the application process. The appellant has made it clear that aside from the original plans (drawing nos. 102 Rev. B, 103 Rev. A, 104 Rev. B, 105 Rev. A) (Scheme A) and the plans which propose a roof extension set in from the northern side only (drawing nos. 106, 107, 108, 109) (Scheme B), the other revised plans would be unviable. The appeal will therefore have regard to both Scheme A and Scheme B only.

## Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the West Hill Road Conservation Area.

## Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The site is within the West Hill Road Conservation Area (CA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that

special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. Paragraph 199 of the Framework states that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. Irrespective of the degree to which the development would be seen from outside the site, harm to the character and appearance of the building would still inherently result in a failure to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

7. The West Hill Road Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Strategy notes a mixture of building types, architectural styles, and ages in the CA. The site is a mid-terrace house located towards the corner whereby Wimbledon Park Road meets Merton Road. The property and the terrace as a whole is well maintained and represents a distinct character which contributes positively to the CA. The main body of the property has a pitched roof. There are currently no roof extensions on the main roof of the property, or those either side of it.

#### *Scheme A*

8. Due to its size, and flat roof, the roof extension would dominate the rear roof slope of 112 Merton Road and alter its form and appearance. It would be unsympathetic to the existing character of the building and the wider terrace, and disrupt the terrace's rear roofscape. It would appear incongruous between the properties adjacent to it, for which the roofs are currently unaltered, and cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the terrace as a whole.
9. Although there are trees to the rear of the property, the roof extension would still be partially visible from the public realm, and the trees could not in any case be relied upon to provide screening in perpetuity. The appeal is considered with respect to its own individual merits. The roof extensions at other properties in the vicinity of the site are different to the one proposed and possess different contextual circumstances. They do not justify or mitigate the harm that would arise from the roof extension proposed.
10. The Wandsworth Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document Housing (SPD) states that extensions should respect the form and proportions of the original house, aim to be sympathetic to the style and character of the house, and complement the surrounding buildings. For the reasons above, the roof extension would not adhere to the guidance provided in the SPD.

#### *Scheme B*

11. The amendments made to the size, design, and placement of the roof extension would result in a minor mitigation of the harm identified in Scheme A. The amendments would not be sufficient to alleviate the harm, and the roof extension in Scheme B would therefore also fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

#### *Conclusion*

12. Both Scheme A and Scheme B would be seen from a very small proportion of the CA and the extent of the harm to the heritage asset would therefore be less than substantial. However, no substantive public benefits have been put forward to weigh against this harm.

13. For these reasons, the roof extensions in Scheme A and Scheme B would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. They would fail to comply with Policy D6 of the London Plan (March 2021), Policy IS 3 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Core Strategy (March 2016), and Policies DMS 1, DMS 2, and DMH 5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (March 2016) which together seek to ensure development is of a high quality and well designed, that heritage assets are conserved, and that the existing character of the borough is protected. They would also fail to align with the Framework and its aim to conserve heritage assets.

### **Other Matters**

14. The Council have found no issue with the proposed rooflights. These would be minor alterations and there is therefore no reason to disagree with the Council on this matter. This would not mitigate the harm identified.
15. Although other schemes which could potentially avoid harm to the character or appearance of the CA are not considered viable options, this does not justify or mitigate the harm that would arise from Scheme A or Scheme B.
16. Providing additional space for the appellant's growing family is a personal circumstance and it seems some additional accommodation could be achieved by other means. It therefore holds very little weight which would not outweigh the harm identified.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

17. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*C Glaister*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

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

*K Taylor*

INSPECTOR