



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022 by C Glaister BSc (Hons)

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/21/3286112

175 Battersea Bridge Road, London SW11 3AS

- 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 Alex Cruz-Farmer against the decision of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2021/3879, dated 17 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a 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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Battersea Park Conservation Area; and
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with regard to outlook and whether or not it would be overbearing or create a sense of enclosure.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The site is a three-storey end-of-terrace property located within the Battersea Park Conservation Area (CA). The roofscape of the terrace is varied in its form and height. No 175 Battersea Bridge Road is clearly subservient to the rest of the terrace and respects the character of the roofscape. The terrace as a whole contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA.
5. The mansard roof extension would be particularly prominent when approached from the north. Increasing the height of the property would harm the relationship between the appeal site and the rest of the terrace, and No 175 would fail to remain subservient to 177 Battersea Bridge Road. The extension

- would be conspicuous and limit the visual significance of the terrace as a whole.
6. The Wandsworth Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document Housing (SPD) identifies the variety between buildings at roof level as an important characteristic that should be maintained. The extension would diminish the variety between buildings at roof level and erode the distinctive character of the terrace. It would therefore fail to align with the guidance provided in the SPD.
 7. The mansard roofs towards the centre of the terrace are largely obscured and less visually prominent. They are designed differently to the proposal, and are seen within a different context. The appeal is considered with regard to its own individual merits. The existing mansard roofs would not justify or mitigate the harm that would arise from the roof extension.
 8. 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 National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. The development would be seen from a small section of the CA and consequently the extent of the harm to the heritage asset would be less than substantial in the terms of the Framework. As the development relates to only one dwelling, the contribution to the housing stock for larger family dwellings would be minor, and the weight of the public benefit would be very limited. Improvements to the sustainability of No 175 would also be minor and hold very limited weight. The total weight of these considerations would not outweigh the great weight given to the conservation of the designated heritage asset.
 9. For these reasons, the development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Battersea Park Conservation Area. It would not therefore comply with Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) or Policies DMS 1, DMS 2, and DMH 5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (March 2016) (DMP) which together seek to ensure that development contributes positively to local spatial character, conserves the features and elements that contribute to a heritage asset's significance and character, and does not harm the street scene.

Living Conditions

10. To the north and northeast of the appeal site are the gardens and rear elevations of several dwellings along Petworth Street. The extension would remain entirely within the confines of the existing property's footprint, and the distance between these dwellings and the proposed development would be considerable. Given the relatively modest width of the development, and the existing height of No 177, the extension would have an insubstantial impact on the outlook for neighbouring residents. For these reasons, the extension would also avoid being overbearing and would not create a sense of enclosure for the occupiers of the dwellings along Petworth Street.
11. The Council have found no harm in regard to the development's impact on light for neighbouring residents. The daylight and sunlight assessment indicates that the development would have a very limited effect upon the light available to

the windows and gardens of neighbouring properties. There is no reason to disagree with the Council on this matter, and the same view is reached in this recommendation.

12. For these reasons, the development would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with regard to outlook, overbearing, or enclosure. It would therefore comply with Policy DMS 1 of the DMP where it relates to ensuring development does not harm the amenity of occupiers/users and nearby properties.

Other Matters

13. An absence of objections from the Battersea Village Residents' Association and the Battersea Artists Quarter is a neutral matter. Even if none of the properties within the terrace are listed, the development would still affect a designated heritage asset. Whether or not the development would affect a designated strategic or local view, and irrespective of whether No 175 itself currently makes a positive contribution to the CA, harm would still occur to the character and appearance of the CA.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The lack of harm in terms of the living conditions of neighbouring residents would not mitigate or outweigh the harm identified. 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

15. 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