
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2022

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26TH May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/22/3295649
59 Roseneath Road, London, SW11 6AG

- 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 Robert & Heather Dembitz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2021/4933, dated 27 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is construction of roof extension on rear roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of roof extension on rear roof slope at 59 Roseneath Road, London, SW11 6AG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/4933, dated 27 October 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 04-59; 05-59; 06-59; 07-59; and Fire Safety Report (dated 27 October 21).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and wider terrace.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid-terrace dwelling, constructed in the late 1990s. The properties either side of the appeal site and on the opposite side of Roseneath Road and Walsingham Place form part of the same development and comprise of rows of terraced townhouses interspersed with detached houses of a similar design. Gaps between the rows of terraces and detached dwellings are narrow. Many of the properties have been subsequently altered and extended, including several with roof extensions and dormers.

4. The proposal is for a mansard roof extension to the rear roof slope of the dwelling. A similar mansard roof extension is also proposed to the rear of 57 Roseneath Road. I am also the appeal Inspector for that proposal¹.
5. Whilst there are no other rear roof extensions within the terrace that includes the appeal property, there is a mansard type roof addition on the detached house that is immediately adjacent to the terrace, and on several other detached dwellings within the same estate. I also observed that some of the townhouses within nearby terraces have 'box type' dormers of varying scale and designs on their rear elevations.
6. The Council's Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (SPD) provides design guidance for residential extensions, including dormers and roof extensions. This guidance states mansard style additions to the rear slope of mid-terraced houses where the roofs are subdivided by party walls are usually acceptable where these cannot be seen from the street. The SPD also states that it is unlikely that the addition of mansard roofs will be considered as an acceptable alteration to roofs, which are visible from public areas within conservation areas.
7. The appeal site falls outside of the Clapham Common Conservation Area (CA) which is located over 80 metres to the east. The rear elevation of the appeal property is not publicly visible from the CA and the proposed roof extension would not therefore have any material effect on the setting of the CA or views from it.
8. Whilst there is no party wall between Nos 59 and 61, the existing terrace is divided by several party walls, including between Nos 57 and 59, and between Nos 61 and 63. The ridge line of the terrace is therefore already interrupted by party walls and the creation of a raised party wall element between Nos 59 and 61 would not be materially harmful to the appearance of the terrace or the street scene. The proposed extension would not be visible from any public areas due to the lack of gaps between the closely knit dwellings along Manchuria Road to the rear of the site. I therefore find that the proposal would be consistent with the design guidance set out in the SPD.
9. I acknowledge the Council's concern that within the estate, only the detached houses display mansard style roof additions. Whilst this may be the case, given the similarities in their design and the lack of visual separation between the detached houses and the rows of terraces, the proposed mansard roof addition would be seen in the same context as the mansard on No 65 Roseneath Road and on several of the other detached houses within the estate. Furthermore, there are many examples in the wider surrounding area of mansard type roof additions.
10. Whilst the raising of the eaves on the rear elevation would result in the removal of the second-floor dormers, the windows would nonetheless remain aligned and the removal of this architectural feature would not, in my opinion, be harmful to the overall appearance of the terrace. I also note that the second-floor rear dormers are not common to all of the dwellings within the estate nor do they appear to be a particular feature of the surrounding area. The distinctive contrasting horizontal banding would also be retained, ensuring

¹ Appeal ref. APP/H5960/D/22/3295648

visual continuity. The proposed extension would be constructed in appropriate, matching materials.

11. The proposed mansard roof would extend across the width of the dwelling and would be adjacent to that also proposed at No 57 Roseneath Road. Given the context of the appeal site and the presence of other mansard type roof additions, I do not consider that the scale or design of the proposal would unacceptably disrupt the continuation of the terrace or be unsympathetic or out of character with the area. I am therefore satisfied that it would comply with Policy DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (adopted 2016) (LP) which amongst other things, seeks to ensure that extensions are well designed, use appropriate materials and is no so large that it dominates and competes with the original building.
12. In conclusion on this main issue, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and wider terrace. Thus, it would comply with Policies DMS1 and DMH5 of the LP and the Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2016) which together seek to ensure development integrates with its surroundings and is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR