



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2022 by R Dickson BSc (hons) MSc

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/22/3295665

19 St Ann's Crescent, London SW18 2NE

- 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 Omar Wafai against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2021/5334, dated 23 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "alterations to the existing main roof, including a roof extension to the rear and a conservation velux window to the front slope".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to the existing main roof, including a roof extension to the rear and a conservation velux window to the front slope at 19 St Ann's Crescent, London, SW18 2NE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/5334, dated 23 November 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, including the specification of the conservation roof window and the materials specified thereon: 41220/PR01, 041220/PR04, 041220/PR05, 041220/PR06, 041220/PR07, 041220/PR08, 041220/PR09, 041220/PR10, 041220/PR15, 041220/PR16, and 041220/PR17
 - 3) Details of the colour, profile and finish of the materials to be used in all new windows and zinc roof cladding in the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing prior to their installation. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) The window in the north-west elevation at second floor level of the development hereby approved shall be installed as obscure-glazed and non-opening as specified on drawing 041220/R16. The window shall thereafter be maintained and retained as such.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. St Ann's Crescent is situated within the CA, within character area F. The CA derives special interest and significance from the fine-grain pattern of development, landmark buildings and open spaces. The Grade II* listed St Ann's Church is the focal point for character area F, which is a quiet residential area, set away from the busier roads closer to the centre of Wandsworth.
5. The Wandsworth Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document Housing (SPD) sets out that alterations to roofs in a CA should preserve the original appearance of those parts of the house that can be most easily seen from the street and the way the house contributes to the street scene. It requires that window details relate to the original building and that materials for roof extensions should match the existing dwelling. It further advises that mansard style additions to mid-terraced houses are usually acceptable where they cannot be clearly seen from the street, but should be avoided on end-terrace and corner properties where unsightly alterations to the shape of the gable end would be clearly visible from the street and harm the CA.
6. 19 St Ann's Crescent is one of a pair of semi-detached properties positioned opposite St Ann's Church, at a bend in the road. The pair is positioned away from other properties on Eglantine Road, Aspley Road and Rosehill Road, which provide a backdrop to them. Neither of the properties appears to have been significantly altered and the original Victorian form is still apparent. The garden and rear of the appeal property are not visible from public land, only from the private land of the houses around the appeal site.
7. The proposed roof extension would occupy much of the rear roof slope but would be set lower than the roof ridge, up from the eaves, and in from both the gable end and party wall, so the original roof form and features of the dwelling such as the two-storey outrigger would still be visible.
8. The materials proposed would not match the existing dwelling, but the use of zinc would complement the traditional slate roof and the contemporary form and materials proposed would enable the roof extension to be visually read as a modern alteration. As a result, the original form of the rear would still be able to be appreciated. While the glazed side is unusual, it would make the structure appear more lightweight. The rear window would complement the existing windows in proportion and position.
9. Consequently, I do not find that the proposed extension would be an excessive size or overly dominant, nor would it appear incongruous in relation to the existing dwelling. It would not therefore harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
10. Only a small part of the proposal would protrude above the parapet along the party wall, and given the distance and relative heights, this would not be easily visible from any public vantage point. Therefore, the roof extension would only be easily seen in private views. There are numerous examples of mansard roofs and different styles of dormer on surrounding properties, therefore this addition would not appear out of place in this context.

11. Importantly, the proposed rear roof extension would not be seen within the context of St Ann's Church. The proposed front roof window would be seen within the same view as the church, however the original roof profile would be retained. Furthermore, a conservation type roof window is proposed, which would ensure that it would blend with the profile of the roof, and not be incongruous. Consequently, the proposal would not adversely affect any views to or from the listed church, its setting or features of special interest that it possesses.
12. The proposed development would alter the pair of properties and a relatively unchanged dwelling, however it would not harmfully alter the parts visible from public vantage points, and the SPD acknowledges and accepts that changes to the rear, where not publicly visible, can be accommodated even in CA's. It would not affect the fine grain character of the buildings within the CA or the relationship with the landmark buildings or open spaces. Consequently, the proposed development would not harm the features which contribute to the special interest and significance of the CA and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.
13. Accordingly, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the CA. It would not conflict with Policies IS3 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Core Strategy (2016), or Policies DMS1, DMS2, and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2016), which collectively aim to ensure that extensions are well designed, and that they do not cause harm to the character and appearance of a conservation area.
14. Furthermore, I find no conflict with the aims of the guidance in the SPD or the Wandsworth Common Conservation Appraisal, or with the heritage and design policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework).

Other Matters

15. This appeal has been dealt with on its own merits and has been found to be acceptable due to a range of site-specific factors, as discussed above. This appeal would not set a precedent for the area, nor would it indicate that the same development would be acceptable at No 21, which is quite different to the appeal site in terms of its public visibility.
16. A neighbour raised concerns with regards to privacy and overlooking from the window on the side elevation of the proposed roof extension. This is shown on the plans to be fixed and obscure glazed, and this can be secured by condition to ensure that privacy is maintained.

Conditions

17. In addition to the standard commencement condition and those discussed above, a condition to require the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for certainty. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the parties and, where necessary, have made minor changes to the wording to ensure that they are precise and otherwise meet the Framework tests for conditions.
18. A condition for matching materials is proposed by the local planning authority, however this is not reasonable as different materials have been proposed. Some materials details are specified on the plans however this does not include

all details of the new windows and zinc roof cladding. Therefore, a condition is necessary to secure these details to ensure high quality development within the CA.

Conclusion and Recommendation

19. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out above.

R Dickson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

20. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and agree with the recommendation. On that basis the appeal is allowed subject to conditions.

L McKay

INSPECTOR