

---

# Appeal Decision

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

**Decision by S Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 6 May 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/21/3285853**

**40 Kelmscott Road, London SW11 6QY**

- 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 Hurst-Brown against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
  - The application Ref 2021/3462, dated 20 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2021.
  - The development proposed is construction of a single storey side / rear extension, roof alterations including loft extension with new front dormer windows and addition of a terrace over rear outrigger.
- 

## 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 of the development used in the Council's officer report and decision notice provides a more complete description than that which is used in the application form and which is repeated in the banner heading above. I have taken into account that the proposal includes alterations including the erection of roof extensions to front and rear roof including raising the ridge by 300mm (with French doors and safety railings), and erection of extension and formation of roof terrace with screen surround above back-addition in addition to the erection of a single-storey side and rear extension.
4. The Council have raised no significant concerns over the erection of single-storey side and rear extension. The focus of this appeal will therefore be on the erection of roof extensions to front and rear including raising the ridge and erection of extension and formation of roof terrace above back-addition.

## Main Issue

5. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed erection of roof extensions to front and rear including raising the ridge and erection of extension and formation of roof terrace above back-addition on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

## Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is located within a residential terrace that has relatively consistent property appearances, including front roof slopes. The uniformity and rhythm of the street makes a positive contribution to its character. There are numerous front roof lights, however the roof form of the terrace remains mostly uniform. There are some examples of front roof extensions on the appeal street, though they do not form the predominant character of the area, and larger roof alterations are generally located to the rear.
7. The proposal seeks to erect a full mansard roof extension, which includes significantly altering the front roof slope. This would disrupt the relatively consistent front roof form of this terrace, which would be detrimental to the character of the area.
8. Examples of front mansard style extensions exist at 102 and 105 Kelmscott Road, however these are a significant distance from the appeal site and are not seen in the same context as the appeal property. Whilst there are also large front extensions at 12 and 37 Kelmscott Road, these are not in the same mansard style as the proposal, and the proposed extension would still appear out of keeping. The front roof extensions at 13 and 21 Kelmscott Road feature slightly smaller dormers, that, although bulky, do not alter the roof form to the same extent as the proposal would. Regardless of the presence of a small number of front roof extensions, as mansard style front extensions do not form the predominant character of the area, the proposal would appear out of keeping.
9. The property at 143 Lavender Hill features a full mansard roof extension, however it is a substantial distance from the appeal site. Moreover, No.143 is on a shorter terrace in an area with more varied roof forms than the appeal site and is therefore not directly comparable to this proposal.
10. The proposed roof alterations as a whole, including full mansard extension, raising the ridge height, roof extension over existing back addition and roof terrace, would add significant bulk at roof level. Moreover, it would be of a form that would reflect the original form or massing of the building. Accordingly, it would appear dominant and incongruous over the existing property as well as the neighbouring properties, which would be harmful to the appearance of the host dwelling and wider terrace.
11. Whilst 107 and 109 Kelmscott Road both feature large flat roof areas over the back additions, with No.109 including a large roof terrace area with screen, the overall scale at roof level of these alterations appears less than that which is proposed in this appeal. Similarly, the development permitted at 111 Kelmscott Road does not include a front mansard style extension and would therefore not impact the surrounding area to the same extent as the appeal proposal. The alterations at Nos. 107, 109 and 111 all achieve a greater level of subordination to their host dwellings than the appeal proposal would. Irrespective of this, Nos. 107, 109 and 111, whilst on Kelmscott Road, are a significant distance from the appeal site. The roofscape surrounding these properties is slightly more varied than that surrounding the appeal site, and therefore the proposed roof alterations would still appear out of place.
12. Overall, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies IS3

and PL1 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted 2016), which together aim to protect existing character and local distinctiveness. Likewise, it would not accord with Policies DMS1 and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (adopted 2016), which together look to ensure the scale, massing and appearance of development contributes positively to spatial character, extensions do not dominate the original building and roof extensions and alterations are not visually intrusive and do not harm the street scene.

13. The proposal would also be contrary to the aims of the Wandsworth Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document Housing (adopted 2016), which outlines how visible mid-terrace roof extensions can look bulky and out of proportion to the roof.

### **Other Matters**

14. The proposal would allow the creation of additional floorspace, however I do not consider this private benefit to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

15. 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**

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

*S Ashworth*

INSPECTOR