



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by M. P. Howell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Monday 28 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/21/3284428

41 Comyn Road, Flat Part First and Second Floor B, London SW11 1QB

- 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 Allyoudeen Mungul against the decision of London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2021/3416, dated 19 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is for the addition of a dormer / loft conversion to the rear of 41B Comyn Road to create an additional bedroom with ensuite. The dormer is to be created by raising the rear elevation wall. The dormer is to have a flat roof and will include 2no. new opening windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and area; - and
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with regard to outlook from neighbouring gardens and properties facing the appeal site.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a mid-terrace two storey period building with accommodation in the roof. The dwellings on Comyn Road are predominately uniform in appearance, set back behind a small front garden, with bay windows, a red brick finish and pitched roofs. The uniformity as well as coherent design features and materials provides a pleasant character and appearance to the terrace. The rear of the terrace is contained from public view, and there is greater variation to the rear elevation of properties in the terrace. Nonetheless, alterations to the roofs are relatively minor, with dormers breaking through the eaves, but they predominantly sit below the ridge line or do not extend across the whole width of the property, maintaining the pitched roof appearance.
4. The dormer would include the majority of the width of the rear roof plane and extend above its ridge. By virtue of its scale, height and design, the proposed dormer would be a discordant and incongruous box like addition to the rear of

the appeal property. It would erode the general consistency to the roofscape and appear considerably bulkier than the existing dormers that sit below the ridge line and have retained much of the rear roof slope. Furthermore, the impact of the dormer would be exacerbated by the use of render as an external finish, which would be at odds with the slate material found at roof level. Accordingly, the proposed dormer would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host property and rear terrace street scene.

5. Furthermore, due to the slope of the road, there is a step up in ridge height after every other dwelling. In this instance, the dwelling to the left is marginally lower, but to the right is of an equivalent height. The height of the proposed dormer, above the existing main ridge, would be appreciable from localised views outside the site on Comyn Road and from wider viewpoints of the terrace from Eckstein Road. As such, the height of the proposed dormer would be noticeable above the existing roof height, disrupting the stepped profile of the roofscape and damaging the character and appearance of the area.
6. I, therefore, conclude that the proposed dormer would be harmful to the character and appearance of the property and the area, contrary to Policies DMS1 and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Development Management Local Plan 2016 (LP) and the Wandsworth Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). These policies and guidance, seek to ensure that the scale, massing, and appearance of proposals are of a high-quality design and does not harm either the street scene or the building's appearance.

Living Conditions

7. Although the dormer would be substantial in scale and height, it would be situated behind the existing two storey rear projections and terrace. As such, to view the proposed dormer beyond the rear projection and terrace, a neighbouring garden or window facing the site would need to be a significant distance away. As such, any views from neighbouring gardens and windows would be distant from the proposed dormer, ensuring that it would not be an overbearing feature that would unacceptably affect their existing outlook.
8. Therefore, I do not consider that the outlook from properties and gardens facing the site would be unduly affected by the proposed dormer extension to the property. Accordingly, the scheme would be acceptable in regard to living conditions of neighbouring properties, complying with Policy DMS1(c) of the LP and the guidance within the SPD. The policy and guidance, which amongst other matters, seek to permit developments that would not harm the living conditions of occupiers and nearby properties through unsatisfactory outlook.

Other Matters

9. An example is given by the appellant of an approved roof extension at nearby property, 48 Aliwal Road¹. I have regard to this example but given the differences in the design and scale of the dormer at this location and the proposal before me, they do not alter my findings in respect of the proposal's harmful design and impact on the host building.
10. The appellant outlines that the proposal would be making effective use of land in an accessible urban area in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Even if I were to agree that the proposal was a more efficient use of

¹ Planning Application reference 2013/2303

land and would contribute to the housing mix in an accessible location, given the scale of the scheme such benefits would be small. This is also the case for the economic and social benefits of the building works and occupation of the site. These benefits do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the Development Plan and the Framework.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

11. Although I consider that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, a lack of harm to living conditions is a neutral factor that does not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area.
12. For the reasons given above and taking into account the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M. P. Howell

INSPECTOR