
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: 18 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/22/3296117
131 Latchmere Road, London, SW11 2JY

- 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 Mrs Maria Laura Bertolaccini against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2021/5366, dated 25 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of single storey rear part of house and replacement with single storey rear extension and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of single storey rear part of house and replacement with single storey rear extension and first floor rear extension at 131 Latchmere Road, London, SW11 2JY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/5366, dated 25 November 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: 669.01; 669.02; 669.03 Rev A; 669.04 and 669.07. It shall also be carried out in full accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment (Ref. 669, dated 01 December 2021) unless otherwise approved in advance by the local planning authority.
 - 3) No development shall take place until details/samples of the materials including the timber sash windows, doors, second hand London stock bricks and guttering, drawings at a scale of no less than 1:20 of the boundary walls and guttering details, and further information in regard to repairing and repointing the original boundary wall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.
 - 4) The roof lights hereby permitted, shall be of a conservation area specification i.e. in-line and flush within the roof pitch that they would be located.
 - 5) The roof area of the development hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area and furthermore, no

balustrades, railing or other means of enclosure or means of permanent access shall be erected on this area.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, including on Shaftesbury Park Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey, end of terrace dwelling. It occupies a prominent corner plot at the junction of Latchmere Road and Sabine Road.
4. The appeal site is located within Shaftesbury Park Estate Conservation Area (CA). In the vicinity of the appeal site, it derives its significance from the historic street layout and the architectural uniformity of the terraces, including the butterfly roof seen on some properties.
5. The proposed alterations and extensions comprise a single storey rear extension which extends across the full width of the dwelling and a smaller first floor extension. The Council raise no objection to the single storey element of the proposal and I note that a virtually identical single storey extension received planning permission in 2021¹.
6. Both sides also refer to a previous appeal decision on the site for a part single storey, part first floor extension which was dismissed in 2017² (the previous appeal). As it was for a similar form of development, the previous appeal decision is a material planning consideration. However, the current proposed first floor extension incorporates a mono pitch roof and is therefore materially different to the flat roof design of the previous appeal proposal.
7. The proposed first floor rear extension would be of a limited depth of about 3.2m and would extend one half of the butterfly roof form as a new first floor outrigger. The scale of the proposed extension would therefore be relatively limited and in my view would not represent an over-dominant addition. By extending the half of the butterfly roof with a mono pitch roof the extension would be in keeping with the design and appearance of the host dwelling. Furthermore, the original butterfly roof form of the house, which is one of the key features of the CA, would be maintained.
8. I noted on my site visit that many of the nearby dwellings have been extended at first floor level and that pitched roof forms are common within the CA. Of particular relevance is a first floor extension to 123 Latchmere Road which is within the same terrace as the appeal proposal and is of a very similar design and appearance. I acknowledge the Council's observations that this extension is not as prominent in the street scene as the appeal proposal, however it does nonetheless form part of the context to the appeal site.
9. In addition, several of the dwellings to the rear of the appeal property along Eversleigh Road, also display first floor pitch roof additions, including on the opposing corner. Whilst the proposed extension would be visible from Latchmere Road and Sabine Road, it would nonetheless reflect and respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

¹ LPA ref. 2021/2828

² Appeal Ref. APP/H5960/D/17/3173421

10. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation area. Furthermore, paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) outlines how, irrespective of whether the harm is less than substantial, great weight would be given to a heritage asset's conservation. However, for the reasons outlined above, I am satisfied that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.
11. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies DMS1, DMS2 and DMH5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (adopted 2016), and the Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2016) which together seek to ensure development is sympathetic to local character, conserves the appearance, character and setting of heritage assets and uses appropriate materials. It would also comply with the Framework insofar as it seeks high quality development that is sympathetic to local character and to protect heritage assets.

Conditions

12. I have undertaken some minor editing and rationalisation of the conditions suggested by the Council in the interests of precision and clarity.
13. The approved plans condition is imposed for clarity. Conditions relating to the roof lights and to the provision of details / samples of materials are necessary in the interests of the visual amenity of the CA. A condition preventing the use of the roof area of the development is imposed to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons outlined above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR