



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2022

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/22/3294158

162 & 164 Heythorp Street, London SW18 5BU

- 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 Sanjeev Mall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2021/4828, dated 18 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is rear mansard and pod roof extension at No 162 and rear pod roof extension at No 164.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Heythorp Street is a residential street comprising terraced dwellings; 162 Heythorp Street is end of terrace and no 164 is mid terrace. From my site visit I saw that the majority of properties along the street at the rear have mansard roof extensions and there are a number of single storey extensions. The appeal properties are different and have a two-storey extension.
4. Despite the range of extensions to the original properties and some differences in appearance, the terraces are in general harmony with each other and there is manifest uniformity in the roofscape and upper floors, owing to the consistency in mansard roofs and single storey extensions. This creates a clear sense of balance which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The erection of a mansard roof extension to the main rear roof at no 162 is not in dispute, however the mansard roof extension above the two-storey back addition at both properties would be overly dominant and a bulky addition to the original properties. It would be prominent in the roofscape, detracting from the consistent roof lines in this section of the street, owing to the scale of the extension in comparison to the existing roofscape. Moreover, it would unbalance the otherwise harmonious character and appearance of the area, and thereby appear incongruous.
6. I have considered the other examples of existing mansard roof extensions over rear additions, of which there are a very large number, and therefore a feature

of the wider area. However, they are notably absent from the terraces immediately around the appeal site. The examples provided are on different streets and are not directly comparable, having different contexts to the proposal before me. As such, a decision to refuse permission at the appeal site would not be inconsistent with other decisions that have been taken in the area.

7. It is noted that the roof extensions would be set in at an angle on both the side and end elevations and be constructed from matching materials, in accordance with the guidance set out in the Council's Housing Supplementary Planning Document (2016). The extensions would also be mirrored on both properties. While this would bring a degree of balance to these two properties in the terrace, it would, nevertheless, be at odds with the prevailing character, for the reasons I have already given.
8. While it may be that the proposal is a viable use of the two properties, optimising the capacity of the site and would provide a good size family dwelling, it does not respond to the site's immediate context. Accordingly, the scale of the proposal would not contribute positively to the local environment. Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy IC3 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Core Strategy (2016) set an approach to ensure that development proposals achieve the highest possible intensity of use. These policies clearly indicate that in doing so, a design led approach should be followed that responds to a site's local context, relating the scale and density of development to the character of the surrounding area.
9. I have also considered the original plans showing a full depth mansard roof extension over the existing two-storey extension. However, this extension would be larger than the proposal illustrated on the Revision A set of plans. It would have a greater presence and be more unbalancing. As such it would have even greater adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.
10. Consequently, for the reasons given, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. This is in conflict with Policy IS3 of the Wandsworth Local Plan Core Strategy (2016), and policies DMS1 and DMH5 of the Development Management Policies Document (2016). These policies, amongst other things, seek development that contributes positively to the local environment, have a high level of physical integration with their surroundings and requires extensions to not be so large that they dominate and compete with the original building and harm the street scene.

Conclusion

11. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that have been shown to have sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR