

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022 by A Coombes

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/21/3284590

Site Address: 6 Penner Close, London SW19 6QA

- 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 Dr Nagy Awadalla against the decision of London Borough of Wandsworth Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/2331, dated 16 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of roof extension to main front roof slope.
-

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 description provided at application stage was "loft conversion". The more comprehensive description that was provided by the Council and used on the appeal form by the appellant has also been used for this decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a mono-pitched roof. The adjoining pair sit within a group of very similar and largely unaltered properties, interspersed by garages. The proposal seeks permission for a dormer roof extension onto the existing mono-pitched roof slope.
6. The proposed extension would disrupt the symmetry of the semi-detached pair. Furthermore, Penner Close has a very distinct character and no roof level alterations have been carried out on the properties. Therefore, the introduction of a dormer would interrupt the otherwise consistent and established roof scape of this cluster of houses. Nearby buildings also incorporate mono-pitched roofs, which contribute to a consistent character that would be harmed by the development. The appeal site is set back from the road more so than other properties in Penner Close. However, despite this, the angle at which it sits, and the landscaping, a dormer roof extension would still be visible from the public realm as well as from properties within the enclave.

7. There are some policies which do encourage upward extensions; however, this is only in situations where such development is appropriate. Due to its visibility, discordance, and failure to integrate with the adjoining property and the overall street scene, the development would not be an appropriate example of an upward extension. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) supports opportunities to use airspace for new homes, but this development would simply provide additional accommodation for an existing property. In some instances, dormer extensions can be carried out as permitted development. However, this appeal scheme requires planning permission and, due to the uniformity of the roof scape of nearby dwellings, the theoretical impact on symmetry caused by a permitted development scheme carries very little weight, and it does not outweigh the harm identified.
8. For the reasons given above, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would not comply with Policies DMS 1 and DMH 5 of the Wandsworth Council Local Plan Development Management Policies Document, adopted 2016. Together these Policies require development to integrate with its surroundings, not appear visually intrusive, or harm the appearance of the street scene or building. Furthermore, the development would not comply with Policy D3 of the London Plan, adopted 2021, as the harm found would not be outweighed by the marginal increased optimisation of a single residential dwelling. There would also be conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

9. The development would provide benefits to the appellant's family in the form of additional floor space and home office space. There would be benefits from this including as it would sit within the existing footprint and could aid with limiting carbon emissions. Any economic benefits associated with increased council tax would be minor. All these matters would relate to a single dwelling and so limited weight has been given to these issues and collectively they would not outweigh the harm that has been found in respect of character and appearance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposal would not accord with the development plan when taken as a whole. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Coombes

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. 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