

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 March 2022 by Max Webb BA (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSC (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/21/3287049

67 Tyneham Road, London SW11 5XQ

- 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 Alex Wood, Puleside Investments Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2021/2981, dated 22 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of roof extension to provide additional floor of accommodation.
-

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 used in the banner heading has been taken from the Council's decision notice, as it provides a more concise description of the development than that which is given on the application form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Shaftesbury Park Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is located in Shaftesbury Park Estate Conservation Area (CA), which, in the vicinity of the appeal site, derives its significance from the architectural conformity of the properties, including the butterfly roofs seen on some properties. Although the Shaftesbury Park Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2009) does not specifically mention the roof form of the terrace row in which the appeal site sits, it does outline that regular and unspoilt roofscapes can be seen in many parts of the CA. The appeal property sits within a terrace of unaltered butterfly roofs. The appeal property's roof form is visible from Sabine Road, and it makes a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the CA.

6. The proposal is for the erection of an extension at roof level that would use bricks to match the host dwelling. The scale and use of bricks at roof level would lead to the proposed extension appearing insubordinate to the existing property. It would also give the rear elevation a significantly more substantial appearance, which would be unsympathetic to the host dwelling and appear discordant in the context of the neighbouring properties.
7. There are other visible roof extensions in the area, however these predominantly utilise a different material, often that which matches the roof rather than the exterior walls of the main property, and this ensures they appear subordinate to their dwellings. Although there are a number of dormer extensions in the area, and these may contribute to the overall character of the CA, the scale and materials proposed mean this extension would cause greater harm to the street scene.
8. The proposal would result in the butterfly roof form seen on the property being filled. The extension would not respect the original roof form and would therefore be detrimental to the architectural integrity of the property. Although contained behind the front parapet, and therefore not visible from the front, the proposal would cause a visible interruption to the conforming roof forms seen on the terrace when moving along Sabine Road to the rear. Whilst there is a tree that somewhat obscures views of the rear of the appeal property, the proposal would still be prominent and the tree, even if in full leaf, would not be enough to preserve the appearance of the roof form of the terrace row. This visibility also ensures the proposal would cause greater harm to the character of the area than other less visible roof extensions in the CA.
9. The development would only be seen from a small section of the CA and consequently it would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires that, in such circumstances, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposed extension would increase the number of bedrooms in the property and amount of storage space; however, this would be a private benefit to the appellant. Even if considered a public benefit by increasing the provision of family-sized accommodation in the area, this would relate to a single dwelling and would have minimal effect on the overall local housing stock. Thus, limited weight can be given to this benefit, and it would not outweigh the harm identified.
10. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. Furthermore, Paragraph 199 of the Framework outlines how, irrespective of whether the harm is less than substantial, great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation. For the reasons outlined above, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
11. It would therefore conflict with Policies DMS1, DMS2 and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (adopted 2016), which together aim to ensure the scale, massing and appearance of development contributes to local spatial character, the conservation of features that contribute to a heritage asset's significance, and visible rear roof alterations do not harm either the street scene or the buildings appearance. Similarly, it would not accord with Policy HC1 of the London Plan (adopted

2021), which looks to conserve the significance of heritage assets. The proposal would also go against the aims of the Wandsworth Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document Housing (adopted 2016), which, with particular regard to butterfly roofs, outlines how extensions on unified terraces have the potential to damage the appearance of the terrace, and would only usually be permitted where no part is visible from the street.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the Development Plan as a whole, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. 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