



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2022

by N Praine BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 MAY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/21/3283088

10 Beatrice Place, London SW19 6BS

- 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 Alastair Bowen-Jones against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2021/1854, dated 5 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is for the Conversion of part of the third-floor terrace (roof level) into a habitable room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 10 Beatrice Place is a three-storey, mid-terrace property. It has a flat roof which is currently used as a roof terrace. No 10 forms part of a wider terrace of dwellings with the immediate row of dwellings featuring a very similar appearance and roofline. This roofline includes matching raised stairwell accesses to one side of the flat roofs and this similarity creates a pleasant, unified rhythm to the terrace when viewing these dwellings.
4. It is proposed to erect an additional floor of accommodation at roof level. The additional floor would be finished in cladding to match the existing roof. The rooftop extension would be setback to the front to create a front terrace and the rear wall of the proposed development would be aligned with the existing rear wall of No 10.
5. Given its setback from the front, views of the rooftop extension would be limited from Beatrice Place. However, while modestly separated with glimpsed views, it would be possible to clearly see the proposed extension and its neighbouring dwellings from Victoria Drive. In particular, views of several dwellings in Beatrice Place, including No 10 and its adjacent neighbours are possible between Our Lady and St Peter Church and 15 Victoria Drive.

6. Although the materials may be appropriate, the proposed development would interrupt the architectural rhythm of the existing stairwells, the unified layout and roofline of this row of dwellings. While it would not be prominent or visually harmful when viewed from Beatrice Place, when viewed from Victoria Drive the rooftop extension would be visually intrusive and fail to integrate within its surroundings.
7. I note that a similar roof extension is also proposed to 9 Beatrice Place, which is the subject of a separate appeal. While this would add a degree of unity to Nos 9 and 10, I have not been provided with any evidence that both developments would be implemented at the same time or even at all. Even if they were, views of the other dwellings in Beatrice Close would be possible from Victoria Drive and the visual imbalance and disruptive impact between Nos 9 and 10, and the neighbouring dwellings would still be apparent from public vantage points.
8. The proposed development would consequently harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies DMS1 and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document 2016 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area. In reaching this conclusion I have had regard to The Wandsworth Local Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2016.
9. The appellant draws my attention to paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and suggests the Council's development plan is not up to date or fully consistent with the Framework. However, the appellant provides no further analysis or discussion as to why this may be the case. In the absence of such evidence this has limited bearing on my decision.
10. The appellant also refers to paragraphs 119, and 125 of the Framework. I have considered these paragraphs and the proposal would provide additional floorspace for the appellant. This additional floorspace does provide an effective and efficient use of land as supported by these paragraphs. However, while this carries some weight in favour of the proposed development, it does not outweigh the harm I have identified above. It also conflicts with paragraph 130 of the Framework in regard to providing development which is sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

11. Interested parties have raised concerns about sunlight/daylight, privacy, security issues, outlook, and noise. As I am dismissing this appeal there is no need for me to consider these matters further.
12. Although the appellant is disappointed that negotiations with the Council were unsuccessful, it is reasonable to accept some development proposals will not reach agreement through negotiation. The Council ultimately made a decision in regard to the submitted drawings and these are the drawings which are before me. The failure to reach agreement between the appellant and the Council has limited bearing on my findings.

Conclusion

13. The appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan for the reasons I have given. There are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

N Praine

INSPECTOR